THE ANONYMOUS TRANSLATOR OF THE *TRANSLATIO VETUS* OF *DE SENSU*

For the series *Aristoteles Latinus* I am preparing the critical edition of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*, on the basis of the MA thesis by L. Peeters.[1] The *Translatio vetus* is preserved in ninety-two manuscripts (in nine of them, the text is incomplete), dating from the thirteenth or fourteenth century.[2] The critical edition will be based on the following manuscripts, which, according to the catalogue of the *Aristoteles Latinus*, all date from the thirteenth century:

Bä: Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery, Ms. W.66 [AL[1] 3], ff. 105r-112v

Bm: Cologny-Genève, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Cod. Bodmer 10 [AL[1] 966], ff. 226v-231v

Bw: Brussel, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Ms. II.2558 (2898) [AL[1] 175], ff. 100r-106r

Sn: Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, Ms. 2706 [AL[2] 1208], ff. 226r-233r

Su: Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, Ms. 2241 [AL[s] 2136], ff. 180r-183r

Td: Todi, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms. 55 [AL[2] 1583], ff.143v-148v

Vü: Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Urb. lat. 2071 [AL[2] 1831], ff. 275r-286v

Wo: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Cod. Helmst. 577 [AL[1] 942], ff. 99r-103v

Only one manuscript of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* mentions the name of a translator. In the upper margin of f. 180r MS *Su* contains the annotation "De sensu et sensato. translatum a nicholao regino discipulo magistri constabuli." The title *De sensu et sensato* has been written in red ink, the attribution in black ink. The text of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*, written in a cur-

I would like to express my gratitude to David Bloch (København) and Guy Guldentops (Köln) for their helpful suggestions. I wish also to thank the Fund for Scientific Research-Flanders, which supports my research as a Postdoctoral Fellow.

[1] See *De sensu et sensato. Translatio anonyma*, ed. G. GALLE et L. PEETERS (AL XIII.1), Turnhout, in preparation; L. PEETERS, *Aristoteles Latinus: De Sensu et Sensato – Translatio Vetus, Voorbereiding voor een kritische editie*, Supervisor: F. BOSSIER, Licentiaatsverhandeling Klassieke Filologie, Leuven 1996 (unpublished).

[2] A complete list of these manuscripts, most of which are discussed in the catalogues of the *Aristoteles Latinus*, will be presented in the introduction to the critical edition of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*. See *Codices, Pars Prior*, ed. G. LACOMBE, A. BIRKENMAJER, E. FRANCESCHINI et L. MINIO-PALUELLO (AL[1]), Roma 1939; *Codices, Pars Posterior*, ed. G. LACOMBE, A. BIRKENMAJER, M. DULONG, E. FRANCESCHINI et L. MINIO-PALUELLO (AL[2]), Cambridge 1955; *Codices, Supplementa altera*, ed. L. MINIO-PALUELLO (AL[s]), Bruges-Paris 1961.

sive hand,[3] contains many interlinear and marginal corrections (providing alternative translations) and glosses. The manuscript can be dated to the thirteenth or fourteenth century.[4] The attribution to Nicholaus Reginus seems to be written in the same hand as the one of the copyist of the text.[5] The codex belonged to the rich library of the Colegio de San Bartolomé of Salamanca, founded by Bishop Diego de Anaya around 1415, but we do not know when the manuscript was incorporated in this collection.[6] The manuscript is mentioned under number 146 in the catalogue of Bishop Antonio Tavira y Almazán, who in 1802 finished an inventory of the manuscripts in the old secular colleges of the University of Salamanca.[7]

Because the problem of the identity of the translator of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* is related to the dating of the translation, I shall first discuss the date of the work; secondly, I shall investigate whether the attribution of the translation of *De sensu* to a certain Nicholaus from Reggio who was a disciple of Constabulus is correct. Because from my investigations I conclude that the attribution is false, I shall investigate whether the translator can be identified with another Greek-Latin translator of Aristotle's works. Thirdly, I shall show that David of Dinant, who is known to have rendered parts of *De sensu* into Latin, cannot be the translator of the *Translatio vetus*.

---

[3] The information on the colours of the ink and on the handwriting is based on the description of the manuscript in O.L. FRANCA y C.C. GONZÁLEZ, *Catálogo de manuscritos de la Biblioteca universitaria de Salamanca* 2: *Manuscritos 1680-2777*, Salamanca 2002, 589-91.

[4] The manuscript is dated to the thirteenth century in MINIO-PALUELLO, *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, Supplementa altera*, #2136; P.O. KRISTELLER, *Iter Italicum* 4, Leiden 1989, 601. The manuscript is dated to the thirteenth-fourteenth century in FRANCA y GONZÁLEZ, *Catálogo de manuscritos*, 589. I would like to express my gratitude to A. Oliva and L.-J. Bataillon (Commissio Leonina) for giving their opinion, on the base of a photo of f. 180r, on the handwriting of the copyist of the manuscript and of the attribution. According to A. Oliva, the manuscript could be dated to the thirteenth as well as to the beginning of the fourteenth century. Bataillon will not opine a date of the manuscript on the base of the photo. I have the impression that the handwriting of the copyist of *Su* is later than the handwriting of other manuscripts of *De sensu* that have been used as a basis for the critical edition, for example MSS *BäSnTdVü*.

[5] D. Bloch, who has compared the handwriting of the copyist of the manuscript with the handwriting of the attribution in detail, concludes that it is likely that the text and the attribution are written by the same hand. In the opinion of Bataillon, the hand that copied the text is the same as the hand that wrote the attribution.

[6] The manuscript is not mentioned in G. BEAUJOUAN, *Manuscrits scientifiques médiévaux de l'université de Salamanque et de ses "colegios mayores"*, Bordeaux 1962.

[7] See the Introduction in FRANCA y GONZÁLEZ, *Catálogo de manuscritos*, 11-16. In 1803 the manuscript became part of the Biblioteca del Palacio Real of Madrid and was subsequently assigned three different numbers: VII-J-4, 2-I-4 and 1122. In 1954 the manuscript returned to Salamanca, to the library of the University.

Fourthly, I shall argue that the anonymous translator of *De sensu* cannot be identified with any of the other Greek-Latin translators of Aristotle's works, or (fifthly) with an anonymous translator of Ptolemaeus and Proclus. Sixthly, I shall investigate whether the Greek exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* can help us to identify the translator. I conclude that the translator of *De sensu* remains anonymous.

On the basis of the attribution to Nicholaus Reginus and on the basis of circumstantial evidence, David Bloch argues that Nicholaus Grecus, one of Robert Grosseteste's *adiutores*, was the translator of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*. He suggests that Nicholaus translated *De sensu* when he was a young man (between 1215 and 1225), not yet a member of Grosseteste's *familia* (which did not exist before 1235), but perhaps already familiar with Grosseteste.[8] His arguments against my thesis that the translator is anonymous have stimulated me to defend my position more strongly. I would like to express my gratitude to Bloch for his useful suggestions and constructive collaboration.

* * *

I. The Date of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*

In another study, I have extensively investigated the dating and earliest reception of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*.[9] I have shown that the arguments for dating the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* in the first decade of the thirteenth century or in the twelfth century, presented in previous studies on the *Aristoteles Latinus*, are not irrefutable. An examination of the manuscripts that contain the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* and a survey of the earliest references to *De sensu* in the Latin West (until ca. 1250) reveal that there is no evidence that this translation was made during the twelfth century. The absence of *De sensu* in twelfth-century manuscripts and the absence of references to *De sensu* in treatises of the late twelfth and early thirteenth century could indicate that the *Translatio vetus* was made only at the beginning of the thirteenth century. However, one cannot exclude the possibility that the *Translatio vetus* already existed during the twelfth century but was not used because scholars were more interested in the other newly-translated Aristotelian works or because the translation of *De sensu* was too difficult to understand. That the thirteenth-century manuscripts transmit a

[8] See D. BLOCH, "Nicholaus Graecus and the *Translatio Vetus* of Aristotle's *De sensu*", in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 50 (2008), 83-103.

[9] See G. GALLE, "The Dating and Earliest Reception of the *Translatio vetus* of Aristotle's *De sensu*", in *Medioevo* 33 (2008), 1-90.

text that is greatly corrupted and contaminated could indicate that the tradition started much earlier, during the twelfth century.

My study has led to the conclusion that 1232 is the earliest *terminus ante quem* that can be established with certainty. The short treatise *De potentiis anime et obiectis* preserved in the manuscripts Oxford, Balliol College Library, Ms. 207, ff. 268ra-271rb, Lincoln, Cathedral Chapter Library, Ms. 221 (C.4.11), ff. 25ra-27vb, and Worcester, Cathedral and Chapter Library, Ms. F.57, ff. 174ra-177va, was written by a theologian between 1228 and 1232, in England or Paris.[10] The author explicitly refers to *De sensu* when he quotes the definition of colour in *De sensu* 4:

> Unde sua definitio est in libro *De sensibus et sensibilibus*: 'Color est extremitas perspicui in corpore determinato'.[11]
>
> Cf. *De sensu* (*Transl. vetus*) 4 (439b11-12): color utique erit perspicui extremitas in corpore determinato.

References to the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* in the treatise *De generatione stellarum*[12] could indicate an earlier *terminus ante quem*, although not with certainty. *De generatione stellarum* refers four times implicitly or explicitly to *De sensu* in its proof that the celestial bodies are mixed bodies composed of elements:

> (1) *De generatione stellarum*: Color est lux in extremitate perspicui in corpore terminato.[13]
>
> Cf. *De sensu* (*Transl. vetus*) 3 (439a18-19): Quemadmodum ergo dictum est de lumine in illis, quod sit color perspicui secundum accidens....
>
> *De sensu* (*Transl. vetus*) 4 (439b11-12): Quare color utique erit perspicui extremitas in corpore terminato [= *variant of* determinato]....

---

[10] On the date and authorship of this treatise, see D.A. CALLUS, "The Powers of the Soul: An Early Unpublished Text", in *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 19 (1952), 131-70, esp. 138-46; C. BURNETT, "The Introduction of Arabic Learning into British Schools", in *The Introduction of Arabic Philosophy into Europe*, ed. C.E. BUTTERWORTH and B.A. KESSEL (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 39), Leiden-New York-Köln 1994, 40-57, esp. 54. Callus holds that the treatise was probably written in England. Burnett argues that it could have been composed in Paris as well.

[11] See the edition by CALLUS in "The Powers of the Soul", 152.1-2. In his *apparatus fontium*, Callus also refers to *De sensu* with respect to the following lines: "Nam visus dicitur prior nobilitate et dignitate, quia ad nobiliorem refertur naturam, scilicet, lucem." However, this statement could also be based on *De anima* III.3 (429a2-3) and *Metaph*. I.1 (980a23-27), to which Callus also refers.

[12] For the edition of *De generatione stellarum*, see L. BAUR, *Die philosophischen Werke des Robert Grosseteste, Bischofs von Lincoln. Zum erstenmal vollständig in kritischer Ausgabe* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 9), Münster i.W. 1912, 32-36.

[13] See ANONYMUS, *De generatione stellarum*, 33.29-30.

(2) *De generatione stellarum*: Et etiam dicit Aristoteles, quod cum lux non sit, nisi in corpore terminato, non est in corpore simplici.[14]

Cf. *De sensu* (*Transl. vetus*) 3 (439a 26-27): Natura itaque lucis in determinato [= *incorrect variant of* indeterminato] perspicuo est.

(3) *De generatione stellarum*: Si autem dicat aliquis, quod ibi est lux, sicut in corpore simplici, et facit apparere solum, cum non sit, ut videtur aurora colorata et mare coloratum, hoc est manifeste falsum et contra illud, quod dicit Aristoteles, quod in simplicibus, quia non est ibi lux in corpore terminato, non apparet eadem lux longe distantibus et prope.[15]

Cf. *De sensu* (*Transl. vetus*) 3 (439b1-5): Videntur autem et aer et aqua colorata; et enim aurora tale est. Sed ibi quidem, quia indeterminate accidit, non eundem colorem habet accedentibus prope et longe nec aer nec mare.

(4) *De generatione stellarum*: Perspicuitas est quaedam natura communis aëris et aquae et ignis et quintae essentiae, ut patet II° de anima capitulo de lucido et in libro de sensu et sensato expressius dicitur.[16]

Cf. *De sensu* (*Transl. vetus*) 3 (439a21-23): quod autem dicimus perspicuum, non est proprium aeri vel aque, nec alicui sic dictorum corporum, sed est quedam communis natura....

De generatione stellarum has been attributed to Robert Grosseteste by many scholars (L. Baur, S.H. Thomson, A.C. Crombie, J. McEvoy),[17] but this attribution has been rejected by R.W. Southern. Because Bloch uses the fact that the first reference to *De sensu* occurs in a work attributed to Grosseteste as evidence in favour of the hypothesis that Nicholaus Grecus, one of the collaborators of Grosseteste (cf. *infra*), was the translator of *De sensu*, I shall briefly present Southern's arguments against the attribution:[18] (1) It is difficult to fit *De generatione stellarum* into the chronological sequence of Grosseteste's works; (2) Southern says that the "brash assertiveness and syllogistic rigidity of its arguments form a contrast at every point to the subtlety and tentative quality of Grosseteste's mind"; McEvoy has also expressed his astonishment that "an intelligent reader could at once know so

[14] See ANONYMUS, *De generatione stellarum*, 34.2-3.

[15] See ANONYMUS, *De generatione stellarum*, 34.8-13.

[16] See ANONYMUS, *De generatione stellarum*, 34.17-19.

[17] *De generatione stellarum* is included in the list of Robert Grosseteste's scientific works by BAUR, *Die philosophischen Werke des Robert Grosseteste*, 68*-69*; S.H. THOMSON, *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste: Bishop of Lincoln 1235-1253*, Cambridge 1940, 100; A.C. CROMBIE, *Robert Grosseteste and the Origins of Experimental Science 1100-1700*, Oxford 1953, 48; J. MCEVOY, "The Chronology of Robert Grosseteste's Writings on Nature and Natural Philosophy", in *Speculum* 58 (1983), 614-55, esp. 622-24, 655.

[18] See R.W. SOUTHERN, *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe*, 2nd edition, Oxford 1992, 124-25.

much and yet understand so little of the Aristotle he had been studying,", and that he adopts Aristotle's idea but then departs from strict Peripatetic doctrine without being aware of it;[19] (3) *De generatione stellarum* contradicts some of Grosseteste's doctrines; (4) the work is attributed to Grosseteste on the basis of a collection in one Czech and three Italian manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that embody a desire to make a complete collection of Grosseteste's writings and are related in their contents. C. Panti, who seriously doubts Grosseteste's authorship, reports that these manuscripts are related and that the attribution to Grosseteste could rely on an attribution in a common exemplar of the manuscripts. Yet she also mentions that in his *De actibus anime*, John Wyclif refers implicitly to *De generatione stellarum*, attributing it to Grosseteste.[20]

The *De generatione stellarum* was composed after ca. 1217-1220, for it contains a quotation from Aristotle's *De animalibus*, which was translated by Michael Scot between 1217 and 1220. J. McEvoy, who accepts the attribution to Grosseteste, dates the work before 1225 or "within a few years on either side of 1220."[21] His dating is based not only on considerations concerning the development of Grosseteste's thought and the chronology of his works but also on the fact that the treatise represents an immature stage in the assimilation of Aristotle's natural philosophy. According to McEvoy, the author's "collection of Aristotelian translations was quite large, though his actual knowledge of Aristotle's ideas was still very lacunary"; confirming this observation is the fact that there are no traces in the text of the great controversies over Aristotle's doctrines (e.g., concerning the eternity of the world).[22]

* * *

II. Nicholaus Reginus

Is the attribution of the translation of *De sensu* to a certain Nicholaus who was from Reggio in Calabria (Southern Italy) and a disciple of Constabulus credible? We have found no traces of a Nicholaus Reginus who translated during the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century. Therefore, we have

[19] MCEVOY, "The Chronology", 622.

[20] C. PANTI, *Moti, virtù et motori celesti nella cosmologia di Roberto Grossatesta. Studio ed edizione dei trattati* De sphera, De cometis, De motu supercelestium (Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi. Testi et studi 16), Firenze 2001, 50-51.

[21] J. MCEVOY, *The Philosophy of Robert Grosseteste*, Oxford 1982, 519; 507-8; IDEM, "The Chronology", 622-24; 655.

[22] MCEVOY, "The Chronology"; 623. IDEM, *The Philosophy*, 508.

investigated whether the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* could have been made by a Nicholaus (not Reginus) who lived in the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century. Could the translator be identified (a) with Nicholaus Siculus, the translator of *De mundo*, who seems to be identical with Nicholaus Grecus, a collaborator of Robert Grossteste; (b) with Magister Nicholaus, a lexicographer, who probably can be identified with Nicholaus Grecus or (c) with Nicholaus of Otranto. Because the evidence militates against any of these being the translator, I argue that (d) the *Translatio vetus* most likely has been attributed falsely to Nicholaus of Reggio, a fourteenth-century translator.

(a) Nicholaus Siculus (or Grecus), Translator of *De mundo*

Of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century Greek-Latin translators of Aristotelian and pseudo-Aristotelian works, one bears the name "Nicholaus". There are two thirteenth-century Greek-Latin translations of the pseudo-Aristotelian *De mundo*: the first translation, which is anonymous, can be attributed to Bartholomew of Messina. The second translation, preserved in a good manuscript dating from the fourteenth century, is attributed to a certain "Nicholaus Siculus", who would have made the translation in Paris.[23] Since Reggio was at that time a part of the *Regnum Sicilie*, we have investigated whether the translator of *De sensu* (Nicholaus Reginus?) could be the same person as the Nicholaus Siculus who translated *De mundo*.

The editors of the translation of *De mundo*, W. Lorimer and L. Minio-Paluello, argue in favour of the identity of "Nicholaus Siculus" and "Nicolaus Grecus."[24] According to the testimony by Matthew Paris, Nicholaus Grecus, who was a Greek by birth and education, assisted Robert Grosseteste (Bishop of Lincoln from 1235 to 1253) in translating the *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum* (1242). He was perhaps the son of the Master Aristotle who appears in England about the end of the twelfth century. By 19 March 1237, he was with Grosseteste and his name is witnessed continuously

[23] See the Introduction by L. MINIO-PALUELLO in *De mundo. Translationes Bartholomaei et Nicholai. Editio altera*, ed. W. L. LORIMER (AL XI[1-2]), revisit L. MINIO-PALUELLO, Bruges-Paris 1965, XII: "in optimo codice; quotation on xxvii: Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Cod. Marc. lat. VI.49 (2218): 'Finis ar. de mundo a nicholao siculo. ex greco in latinum translatus. parisius'."

[24] See L. MINIO-PALUELLO, "Note sull'Aristotele Latino Medievale. III. I due traduttori medievali del *De mundo*: Nicola Siculo (Greco), collaboratore di Roberto Grossatesta, e Bartolomeo da Messina", in *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 42 (1950), 232-37; reprt. L. MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula. The Latin Aristotle*, Amsterdam 1972, 108-13; See the Introduction by MINIO-PALUELLO in *De mundo* (AL XI[1-2]), xxvi-xxxi.

throughout Grosseteste's pontificate. He died on 4 December 1279.[25]

If one accepts that the translator of *De mundo* was Grosseteste's assistant, according to Lorimer this translation should be dated before 1240 because it was made in Paris.[26] Minio-Paluello objects that Nicholaus Grecus might also have been in Paris later in his life, and thus the translation could have been made after 1267-1268. Minio-Paluello's dating is based on the fact that Nicolaus seems to have used Bartholomew's translation, which is usually dated between 1258-1266 and on a statement by Roger Bacon. In his *Opus tertium* (1267-1268),[27] Bacon complains that only Boethius and Grosseteste in his old age translated Greek treatises with enough knowledge of Greek and Latin; other translators, including Bartholomew of Messina (who was employed by King Manfred of Sicily) knew neither the sciences nor the languages.[28] In Minio-Paluello's view, Bacon did not know Nicholaus' translation of *De mundo*, for had he known it he likely would have judged that the translation was worthy of the same praise as Grosseteste's translations and he would not have criticized it as he did the translation of Bartholomew. Minio-Paluello suggests that after 1267 Nicholaus provided a new and much better translation than Bartholomew's.[29] However, because

---

[25] See E. FRANCESCHINI, *Roberto Grossatesta, vescovo di Lincoln, e le sue traduzioni latine*, Venezia 1933, 14-15; J.C. RUSSELL, "The Preferments and *Adiutores* of Robert Grosseteste", in *Harvard Theological Review* 26 (1933), 161-72, esp. 169-70; K. MAJOR, "The *Familia* of Robert Grosseteste", in *Robert Grosseteste: Scholar and Bishop. Essays in Commemoration of the Seventh Centenary of his Death*, ed. D.A. CALLUS, Oxford 1955, 216-41, esp. 229.

[26] W.L. LORIMER, *The Text Tradition of Pseudo-Aristotle* De mundo *together with an Appendix Containing the Text of the Medieval Latin Versions*, Oxford 1924, 28; *De mundo* (AL XI$^{1-2}$), 12.

[27] On the dating of Bacon's *Opus tertium*, see S.C. EASTON, *Roger Bacon and His Search for a Universal Science. A Reconsideration of the Life and Work of Roger Bacon in the Light of His Own Stated Purposes*, Westport, CT 1952, 88.

[28] See ROGERUS BACON, *Opus tertium* c.25, ed. J.S. BREWER, in *Opera quaedam hactenus inedita* I.I, London 1859, 91: "....multa fuerunt male translata, et praecipue de philosophia. Nam oportet quod translator sciat scientiam quam vult transferre et sciat duas linguas, a qua et in quam transfert. Sed nullus scivit linguas nisi Boëtius de translatoribus famosis, nullus scientias nisi dominus Robertus episcopus Lincolniensis,... simul cum hoc quod tantum scivit de linguis quod potuit intelligere sanctos et philosophos et sapientes antiquos. Sed non bene scivit linguas ut transferret nisi circa ultimum vitae suae, quando vocavit Graecos, et fecit libros Grammaticae Graecae de Graecia et aliis congregari. Sed isti pauca transtulerunt. Alii vero qui infinita quasi converterunt in Latinum ut... et translator Meinfredi... praesumpserunt innumerabilia transferre, sed nec scientias nec linguas sciverunt, etiam non Latinum.... Et ideo isti male et pessime transtulerunt, et conturbaverunt totam philosophiam per perversitatem translationis. Et maxime libri Aristotelis sunt destructi per hoc,..."

[29] See the Introduction by MINIO-PALUELLO in *De mundo* (AL XI$^{1-2}$), xxx-xxxi.

Bacon's knowledge of, and judgement on, the translations were defective and negative,[30] his remarks cannot be used as evidence to date Nicholaus' translation of *De mundo*.

I have compared several features of the translations of *De mundo* and *De sensu* in order to determine whether they could have been made by the same translators. A comparison between the Greek-Latin indices of *De mundo* and of *De sensu* leads to the following results:

Similarities: ἀεί: semper; αἰσθητός: sensibilis; δέομαι: egeo; ἐπιπολάζω: supernato; ἤ: mostly 'vel', sometimes 'aut'; ποιέομαι: facio; πρᾶγμα: res; τοίνυν: ergo; τοιοῦτος: talis; χρή: oportet

Differences:

	De mundo	*De sensu*
ἀθρόον	repente	subito
ἅμα	simul (3), pariter (2), una cum (1)	simul (33)
ἄμικτος	immixtus	incommixtus
ἄν	inquam	utique (19), *om.* (10)
ἀνάλογος	analogus	proportionalis
ἀναπνοή	spiraculum	inspiratio (2), spiratio (1)
ἀναφέρομαι	dimitto	ascendo
ἀπό	e(x) (7), a(b) (4)	a(b) (4)
ἀπολαύω	foveor	recipio
γὰρ	mostly 'enim', sometimes 'nam' (15)	enim (122), namque (7), *om.* (2)
γλίχομαι	glisco	cupio
γνωρίζω	nosco	deprehendo
γοῦν	quippe	enim (1), ergo (1)
δή	quidem (4), ergo (1)	*om.* (8), enim (3), ita(que) (1), itaque (? 1), quidem/ergo (1), igitur/ergo (? 1)
δημιουργέω	creo	construo, genero
διά τοῦτο	quamobrem	ideo (3)
διαμένω	persevero	permaneo
διάφορος	alius, diversus, varius	differens
διό	quamobrem (3), propter quod (2), unde (2)	quare (17), unde (1)
διορίζω	divido	determino
δοκεῖ	ut videtur	estimatur, putatur
ὄν	ens	existens
ἐκπνοή	exalatio	expiratio
ἔμφασις	apparentia	apparicio

[30] See R. LEMAY, "Roger Bacon's Attitude Toward the Latin Translations and Translators of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries", in *Roger Bacon and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays*, ed. J. HACKETT (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 57), Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, 25-47.

ἐνέργεια	opus (1)	actio (13), actus (4), operatio (3), effectus (1)
ἔξω	extra (3), extrinsecus (1)	exterius (2), extra (1)
ἐπεί	eo quod	quoniam (9), enim (1)
ἐπειδή	cum	quoniam (2)
ἐπιφάνεια	superficies	epiphania
ἐπιχέω	desuper	infundo
ἔτι	insuper	amplius (17), adhuc (1), etiam (1), *om.*
εὐθύς	protinus	statim (1), subito (1)
ζητέω	peto	quero
ἡδύς	dulcis	delectabilis, sapidus
ἥμισυς	semis	τὸ ἥμισυ: dimidium
θέσις	situs	positio
θώραξ	lorica	torax
ἴσως	fortassis	equaliter, forte
καθάπερ	velut (5), sicut (4), quemadmodum (1), ut (1)	quemadmodum (5), sicut (3), secundum quod (1), ut (1), velud (1)
καθαρός	mundus	purus
κρείττων	maior, potior	melior
λαμπρότης	splendor	claritas
λάμπω	emico, lustro	luceo
λίθος	lapillus	lapis
οἱ λοιποί	ceteri	reliqui
μὲν οὖν	ergo (3), igitur (3)	ergo (11), autem (7), enim (2), siquidem (2), vero (2), itaque (2), igitur (1), namque (1)
οὐ μὴν ἀλλα	imo (1)	necnon sed (1)
νομίζω	existimo, puto	estimo
νοσώδης	pestifer	infirmans
νοῦς	intellectus	mens
ὄγκος	tumor	gleba
οἴομαι	reor	puto
ὄμμα	lumen	oculus
οὖν	igitur (5), ergo (3)	ergo (10), enim (1)
πάλιν	denuo, iterum	rursum (1)
παρά	a, apud, penes, secundum	ex (1), iuxta (1), preter (1)
πάχος	densitas, grossicies	crassitudo
περαίνω	perago, perficio	determino, termino
πορεύομαι	incedo, procedo	transeo
πόρρωθεν	eminus	longe, a longe, de longe
πρᾶξις	negocium	operatio
προσάπτω	adhibeo	assigno
πυρώδης	igneus	ignitus
συμβαίνω	contingo	accido
συμβάλλομαι	cooperor	confero
ταχέως	cito, velociter	celeriter
τε καί	ac, atque, pariter et, simul et	et (3)

τρέφω	foveo	nutrio
τυγχάνω	existo	sum
ὑπεροχή	excellentia	habundantia, superhabundantia
ὑπολάμβανω	estimo	assigno, concipio
φθίσις	corruptio	decrementum
φορά	impetus, motio	latio
χωρίζω	disiungo, distinguo	separo
ψυχρότης	frigus	frigiditas
ὧδε	sic	hoc
ὡς	ut (8), velut (2)	sicut (11), ut (5), ...
ὥσπερ	sicut (5), velut (5), ut (2), ceu (1), quasi (1)	quemadmodum (21), sicut (15), quasi (2), velud (2)
ὥστε	ut (4), quare (1)	quare (23), ita quod (1), igitur (1)

In some cases *De mundo* offers different translations for one Greek term, whereas *De sensu* offers only one of these translations:

	De mundo	*De sensu*
ἀγνοέω	ignoro (1), nescio (1)	ignoro
ἄγω	ago (1), duco (1)	duco
ἀρχή	principium (5), initium (2), principatus (1)	principium
ἄστρον	astrum (2), sidus (3)	astrum
δύναμις	vis (4), virtus (2), potestas (1)	virtus
εἷς	unus (passim), idem (1), quidam (1), unicus (1)	unus
καλέω	appello, dico, nomino, nuncupo, voco	voco
λέγω	aio, appello, dico, loquor, refero	dico
μέρος	membrum, pars	pars
ξηρός	aridus, siccus	siccus
ὅς	hic, qui, quidam	qui
ὅταν	cum, quando	quando
πᾶς	cunctus, omnis, quilibet, quisquis, totus, universus	omnis, quilibet
πλήν	attamen, nisi, preter	nisi
πνεῦμα	flamen, spiritus	spiritus
πολλάκις	multociens, sepe, sepius	multociens
σχῆμα	figura, situs	figura

In other cases *De mundo* and *De sensu* offer several translations for one Greek term, of which some are the same in both texts and some are different:

δέ	autem (passim), vero (passim), necnon (2), at (1), aut (?) (1), tamen (1), -ve (1)	autem (177), vero (68), *om.* (9), enim (4), et (2), etiam (2), sed (2), ergo (1), verum (1)
διαιρέω	distinguo, divido	divido, separo
ἀφικνέομαι	pervenio, proficiscor	attingo, pervenio, venio
λόγος	ratio, sermo	proportio, sermo
ὅστις	qualis, qui	qui, quis?
συνεχής	contiguus, continuus, creber, iugis	continens, continuus

A comparison of the Greek-Latin indices of *De mundo* and *De sensu* shows that in most cases where there are various possible Latin translations for a certain Greek word, the translator of *De sensu* makes another choice than Nicholaus of Sicily, the translator of *De mundo*. In fact, there are more similarities between Bartholomew of Messina's translation of *De mundo* and the translation of *De sensu* than between Nicholaus of Sicily's translation of *De mundo* and the translation of *De sensu*. The following list enumerates Greek words that in Bartholomew's translation of *De mundo* and in the translation of *De sensu* are identical, whereas their translation in Nicholaus' version of *De mundo* and in *De sensu* differs (for the Latin translations, cf. list above): ἄν, διάφορος, ἐκπνοή, ἔμφασις, επειδή, ζητέω, ἥμισυς, θέσις, καθαρός, λίθος, οἱ λοιποί, ὄμμα, πόρρωθεν (de longe), πρᾶξις, συμβαίνω, συμβάλλομαι, τρέφω, φορά, ψυχρότης. Yet this does not mean that Bartholomew of Messina is the translator of *De sensu*.[31]

In his argument in favour of the identity of Nicholaus Siculus and Nicholaus Grecus, Minio-Paluello describes several characteristics of the translation of *De mundo* by Nicholaus Siculus.[32] I have compared these features with the features of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*.

(1) Nicholaus' translation of *De mundo* contains many double readings, of the following types: (a) four of the double readings can be found in the corpus of the text. These double readings are two equivalents of one Greek term connected by *seu*. This technique was also used by Grosseteste in his translation of Simplicius' commentary on *De celo* II but not by other translators. The interlinear and marginal double readings in Nicholas' translation of *De mundo* are of two types: (b) two translations, with different meanings, of one Greek term connected by *vel*; (c) a transliteration or latinization of the Greek followed by *id est* and a translation. These types of doublets (b-c) are not characteristic signs of Grosseteste or his school, inasmuch as they were used by translators before and after Grosseteste.[33] In the manuscripts of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* (collation of the first chapter in all manuscripts; collation of the other chapters in *BäBmBwSnSuTdVüWo*), I have not found any double readings with *seu* (type a). Appendix 1 contains an analysis of the double readings in *Su*, which are all interlinear or marginal.[34] This analy-

[31] See *infra*, p. 135.

[32] See MINIO-PALUELLO, "I due traduttori medievali del *De mundo*" (see n. 24), in MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula*, 108-12; see the Introduction by MINIO-PALUELLO in *De mundo* (AL XI$^{1-2}$), xxviii-xxix.

[33] See MINIO-PALUELLO, "I due traduttori medievali del *De mundo*", 108-9; see the Introduction by MINIO-PALUELLO in *De mundo* (AL XI$^{1-2}$), xxviii.

[34] See *infra*, p. 142.

sis shows that the manuscript tradition of *De sensu* contains double readings of type (b) and (c) and of other types as well, but not of type (a). Hence, Nicholaus' translation of *De mundo* contains double readings that are characteristic of Grosseteste, whereas the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* does not.

(2) As far as Minio-Paluello knows, the translator of *De mundo* is the only thirteenth-century Greek-Latin translator with an almost perfect knowledge of Greek. His knowledge of the Greek language excels that of Burgundio of Pisa, Robert Grosseteste or William of Moerbeke. He understands the Greek text in an intelligent way and renders it in good Latin. He breaks with the tradition of too literal and slavish translations. *De mundo* reads as a Latin text, not as a Greek text written in Latin words.[35] This characterisation does not apply to the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*. Appendix 2 contains several examples of inadequate Greek-Latin translations, which most probably are not due to mistakes in the Greek exemplar but derive from the translator's technique.[36] Some incorrect translations of particles, verbs and cases are in all probability due to the translator's lack of knowledge of the Greek. In some cases the Latin translation becomes unintelligible. In other cases the Latin translation can be understood but it does not correspond with the meaning of the Greek text.

(3) The translation of *De mundo* is characterised by a variety in the use of particles, and this also holds for the translation of *De sensu*. In many cases, the translator of *De sensu* renders the particles inconsistently, for example: ἀλλά μὴν: sed (1), necnon (1); ἀλλά μήν... γε: sed (1); οὐ μὴν ἀλλά: necnon sed (1); μέντοι: vero (2), autem (1), enim (1), itaque (1); γοῦν, δέ, δή, καίτοι and μέν. The translation of some other particles, such as ἀλλά and ἔτι, is more consistent.[37] Yet a comparison of the translations of the particles in *De sensu* and *De mundo* shows that they are translated differently in both texts (cf. *supra*).

From the comparison of the Greek-Latin indices and of some characteristics of the translations of *De mundo* and *De sensu* we can conclude that the translator of *De sensu* cannot be identified with Nicholaus Siculus, the translator of *De mundo*.

(b) Magister Nicholaus, Lexicographer

The Greek-Latin lexicon preserved in the manuscript London, College of

[35] MINIO-PALUELLO, "I due traduttori medievali del *De mundo*", 111; see also the Introduction by MINIO-PALUELLO in *De mundo* (AL XI$^{1-2}$), xxxi.

[36] See *infra*, p. 145.

[37] For a survey of the translations of these particles, see Appendix 2.

Arms (= Heralds' College), Ms. Arundel 9, was written ca. 1290-1300 in an English hand and contains at least sixteen thousand entries. As there are more entries associated with *Magna Grecia* and Sicily than with other places, the lexicographer was most probably a native Greek speaker coming from Sicily or Southern Italy. M.R. James shows that the compiler of the lexicon was closely connected with Grosseteste and his circle.[38] According to Dionisotti, the dictionary was first compiled in bilingual Southern Italy, for local use, and has features that suggest a revision inspired or commissioned by Grosseteste. Dionisotti argues that Grosseteste possibly used this dictionary, but he did not find any trace of Grosseteste's exegesis in it.[39] Yet in M. Holland's opinion, it is likely that the manuscript represents a copy of the prototype used by Grosseteste from the beginning of his translating activities.[40] Because the lexicon was composed within Grosseteste's *familia*, Bloch holds that its final version must have been composed after 1235.[41] In the lexicon, a "magister Nicholaus" is cited twice as an authority. Because the lexicon can be associated with Grosseteste's circle and contains entries on Southern Italy and Sicily, "magister Nicholaus" has been identified with "Nicholaus Grecus."[42] In Bloch's opinion, Nicholaus took a leading role in the compilation of the lexicon and might have made notes on Greek-Latin translations in the years preceding the final version of the lexicon. According to Bloch, Nicholaus translated *De sensu* and probably also *De mundo* before the lexicon was finished.[43]

If Nicholaus Grecus took a leading role in the compilation of the lexicon and can be identified with Nicholaus Reginus and Nicholaus Siculus, we could expect (although not with certainty) some similarity between the translations in the lexicon and in *De sensu* and *De mundo*.

First I have compared the translations in the lexicon in support of which "magister Nicholaus" is cited as an authority with the corresponding words

---

[38] See M.R. JAMES, "A Graeco-Latin Lexicon of the Thirteenth Century", in *Mélanges offerts à M. Émile Chatelain par ses élèves et ses amis, 15 avril 1910*, Paris 1910, 396-411, esp. 399-401.

[39] See A.C. DIONISOTTI, "On the Greek Studies of Robert Grosseteste", in *The Uses of Greek and Latin. Historical Essays*, ed. A.C. DIONISOTTI, A. GRAFTON and J. KRAYE (Warburg Institute Surveys and Texts 16), London 1988, 19-39, esp. 24-25.

[40] See M. HOLLAND, "Robert Grosseteste's Greek Translations and College of Arms MS Arundel 9", in *Robert Grosseteste: New Perspectives on His Thought and Scholarship*, ed. J. MCEVOY (Instrumenta Patristica 27), Turnhout 1995, 121-47.

[41] BLOCH, "Nicholaus Graecus" (see n.8).

[42] See JAMES, "A Graeco-Latin Lexicon", 399-401; BLOCH, "Nicholaus Graecus".

[43] See BLOCH, "Nicholaus Graecus".

in *De sensu* and *De mundo*. The lexicon contains the following references to "magister Nicholaus":

> περίψημα: secundum magistrum Nicholaum dicitur spuma aque vel olle bullientis, et dicitur a *peri* et εψω quod est *lixo, epsin* enim idem est quod *lixare*, unde *epsesis*.
>
> πυρκαία: Secundum magistrum Nicholaum pircaia est domus in qua operatur faber.[44]

Of these Greek words, *De sensu* contains only ἕψω, which is twice translated as *decoquo* (441a16: ἑψομένους = *decoctos*; 443b31 ἕψητε = *decoquis*). This translation differs from the translation in the lexicon but both translations (*lixo* and *decoquo*) are adequate. *De mundo* contains only πυρκαιά, which is twice translated as *incendium* (397a29, 400a29). The lexicographers must have had πυρκαιά in mind, because the word πυρκαιά is not found in Greek dictionaries. The word πυρκαιά could mean "bonfire" or "the ruins of a burned house or city."[45] From this last meaning one can understand the explanation *domus* in the lexicon. The remaining part of the definition "in qua operatur faber" seems to have been invented by "magister Nicholaus", who associated fire with a forge; thus *Faber* probably should be interpreted as "blacksmith".[46] Although one cannot draw conclusions on the basis of so few data, the comparison between the translations in the lexicon associated with "magister Nicholaus" and the corresponding translations in *De sensu* and *De mundo* does not support the identification of "magister Nicholaus" with the translators of either *De sensu* or *De mundo*.

Secondly, Bloch mentions that his comparison of the translations of Greek particles in the *De sensu* and in the lexicon shows that both sources often have the same translation but that almost equally often they do not.[47] I have come to similar conclusions on the basis of a comparison between the translation of some words in the lexicon (on the basis of the very fragmentary Greek *lemmata* with Latin translations provided by M. Holland)[48] and

---

[44] See quotation in JAMES, "A Graeco-Latin Lexicon", 400.

[45] E.A. SOPHOCLES, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, New York-Leipzig 1890, 963.

[46] I would like to thank G. Guldentops, who helped me in finding an explanation of this odd definition in the lexicon.

[47] See BLOCH, "Nicholaus Graecus".

[48] M. Holland provides a table of the main lexical variants in the first three chapters of the translations of *De fide orthodoxa* by Burgundio of Pisa and Robert Grosseteste, and she compares them with the translations in the lexicon; see HOLLAND, "Robert Grosseteste's Greek Translations", 128. She also compares the vocabulary of the lexicon with the vocabulary of a short passage of Grosseteste's translation of the first chapter of Dionysius the Aeropagite's *Mystical Theology*; see EADEM, "Robert Grosseteste's Greek Translations", 140-47. I have not

the translations in *De sensu* and *De mundo*.

Similarities between the lexicon and *De sensu* (I do not mention the words that are translated similarly but for which there is no evident alternative translation):

lexicon-Greek[49]	**lexicon-Latin**	***De sensu*-Greek**	***De sensu*-Latin**
ágω	duco	ἄγω	duco
dunamHs	virtus	δύναμις	virtus
Legω	dico	λέγω	dico
meta (+ gen.) / (+ acc.)	cum./post. ultra	μετά (+ gen.)	cum
nous	mens	νοῦς	mens
pampan	omnino	πάμπαν	omnino
plHθος	multitudo	πλῆθος	multitudo
prωtos	primus	πρῶτος	primus
upókei[d]mai	subiaceo	ὑπόκειμαι	subiaceo

In some cases *De sensu* offers different translations for one Greek term, whereas the lexicon offers only one (or, in one case, two) of these translations:

lexicon-Greek	**lexicon-Latin**	***De sensu*-Greek**	***De sensu*-Latin**
eis	in	εἰς	ad, in + *abl.*, in + *acc.*
ekastos	unusquisque	ἕκαστος	unusquisque (19), quilibet (1)
ἐpí	super	ἐπί	ab, de, in, super, ad
ἕteros	alter	ἕτερος	alius (18), alter (8)
H	vel	ἤ	vel (30), aut (4), ...
mechri	usque	μέχρι	usque ad
νοητός	intelligibilis	νοητός	contemplativus, intelligibilis
οὕτως	sic. Ita	οὕτω(ς)	sic (14), ita (11), taliter, similiter

Differences between the lexicon and *De sensu*:

lexicon-Greek	**lexicon-Latin**	***De sensu*-Greek**	***De sensu*-Latin**
oion	sicut	οἷον	quemadmodum (16), velud (17)
Óte	cum	ὅτε	quando
ὕsteros	posternus	ὕστερος	extremus, posterior

Similarities between the lexicon and *De mundo*:

lexicon-Greek	**lexicon-Latin**	***De mundo*-Greek**	***De mundo*-Latin**
agathos	bonus	ἀγαθός	bonus
ágω	duco	ἄγω	duco
kalos	bonus	καλός	bonus
mén	quidem	μέν	quidem
plHθος	multitudo	πλῆθος	multitudo

consulted the partial editions of the lexicon in the articles by A. GARZYA (see the bibliography in BLOCH, "Nicholaus Graecus").

[49] In the lexicon, the Greek entries are partly transliterated into Roman letters but not in a consistent way.

In some cases *De mundo* offers different translations for one Greek term, whereas the lexicon offers only one (or, in two cases, more than one) of these translations:

lexicon-Greek	**lexicon-Latin**	***De mundo*-Greek**	***De mundo*-Latin**
dunamHs	virtus	δύναμις	potestas, virtus, vis
eis	in	εἰς	ad, in
ekastos	unusquisque	ἕκαστος	quilibet, unusquisque, singulus
entha	ubi	ἔνθα	quo, ubi
ἐpí	super	ἐπί	ad, de, per, super
H	vel	ἤ	aut, vel
kosmos	mundus	κόσμος	cosmos, decor, mundus, orbis, ornatus
lampω	fulgeo	λάμπω	emico, lustro
Legω	dico	λέγω	aio, appello, dico, loquor, refero
mechri	usque	μέχρι	(usque) ad
poiω	facio	ποιέω	ago, efficio, exerceo, facio
οὕτως	sic. ita	οὕτω(ς)	sic
selos *(sic)*	ignis. vel fulgor et lux lune. vel splendor	σέλας	coruscatio, fulgor
sunáptω	conglutio. coniungo	συνάπτω	coniungo

Differences between the lexicon and *De mundo*:

lexicon-Greek	**lexicon -Latin**	***De mundo*-Greek**	***De mundo*-Latin**
átreptos	inversibilis	ἄτρεπτος	invariabilis
gnofos	tenebrositas	γνόφος	turbo
emfaínoo	manifesto	ἐμφαίνω	ostendo
ἕteros	alter	ἕτερος	alius, unus
ischuros	potens	ἰσχυρός	fortis
nous	mens	νοῦς	intellectus
oion	sicut	οἷον	quasi, ut
óte	cum	ὅτε	quando(que)
pais	puer	παῖς	filius
skoteinos	tenebrosus	σκοτεινός	obscurus
tassω	ordino	τάσσω	statuo
ὕsteros	posternus	ὕστερος	-
Xorós	chorus	χορός	chorea

(c) Nicholaus of Otranto

Another translator with the name "Nicholaus" is Nicholaus of Otranto (†1235). He was born around 1160 in Otranto (Southern Italy) and entered the Orthodox cloister of San Nicola in Casole (near Otranto) under the name

"Nektarios".[50] He made Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek translations. Before 1205 he made several Greek-Latin translations of liturgical texts and texts on canon law, such as the (pseudo-)Basileios liturgy (between 1174/78 and 1198), the resurrection of Panagia, the Mystagogy of (pseudo-)Basileios, apostolic canons, preparatory prayers for the liturgy and excerpts from the Rule of Basileios. His translations, which aim at making the Latins familiar with the Greek liturgy and habits, are characterised by a slavish literalness in verbal and sentence constructions.[51]

A comparison between the translations of particles and other frequently used words in *De sensu* and in Nicholaus of Otranto's translation of the brief text *Panagia*[52] (a bread ceremony in honour of Mary) suggests that Nicholaus of Otranto is not the translator of *De sensu*:

Similarities: γὰρ: enim (2); ὅτι: quoniam (3); ὡς: sicut (2)
Differences:

	Panagia	***De sensu***
διό	ideoque (1)	quare (17), unde (1)
ὅταν	cum (1)	quando
πάλιν	iterum (2)	rursum

(d) False Attribution to Nicholas of Reggio, Fourteenth-Century Translator

We know of only one medieval author or translator with the name Nicholaus

[50] See W. BLUM, "Nikolaos-Nektarios, Abt von Casole", in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* 6 (1993), 859-60.

[51] See J.M. HOECK und R.J. LOENERTZ, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto, Abt von Casole. Beiträge zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen unter Innozenz III. und Friedrich II* (Studia Patristica et Byzantina 11), Ettal 1965, 74-82; M. CHRONZ, "Der Beitrag des Nikolaos von Otranto (Nektarios von Casole) zur Vermittlung zwischen den Kulturwelten des 13. Jahrhunderts", in *Geistesleben im 13. Jahrhundert*, hrsg. v. J.A. AERTSEN und A. SPEER (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 27), Berlin-New York 2000, 555-73.

[52] For the Greek text with Nicholaus' Latin translation of the *Panagia*, see R. ENGDAHL, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der byzantinischen Liturgie* (Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche 5), Berlin 1908, 78-82. I have not investigated the lexicon of Nicholaus' Greek-Latin translation of the Liturgy of St. Basil because in the parts in which the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and the Liturgy of St. Basil overlap (i.e., the first part, before the prayer of the catachumens), Nicholaus copies the rubrics of Leo Thuscus' translation of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and only gives the *incipit* of the prayer; in the second part, which Nicholaus translated himself, the influence of his example Leo Thuscus is still apparent. See HOECK und LOENERTZ, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, 74; A. JACOB, "La traduction de la Liturgie de saint Basile par Nicolas d'Otrante", in *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 38 (1967), 49-107, esp. 56. The Greek text of the Liturgy of St. Basil has been edited by ENGDAHL, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der byzantinischen Liturgie*, 43-77, and JACOB, "La traduction de la Liturgie", 58-83.

(Grecus) de Reggio (de Calabria). He was a physician who made Greek-Latin translations of anatomical and medical texts of Galen (some fifty) and of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* at the court of Naples, from 1308 or earlier to 1345 or later.[53] Since this Nicholaus de Reggio was active during the first half of the fourteenth century and the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* must be dated before 1232, he cannot be the translator of the latter work.

The note in *Su* stating that the translator of *De sensu* is a disciple of a certain Constabulus does not help us identify the translator of *De sensu*. Constabulus or Costa ben Luca is the Latin form of the Arabic name Qustā ibn Lūqā. We did not find any information on a Constabulus living in the twelfth or thirteenth century. The famous Costa ben Luca al-baʿlabakkī (ca. 820-912), who was skilled in medicine, philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, logic and music, was born in Syria and lived in Baghdad and Armenia. He is the author of several medical works and made many Greek-Arabic translations of mathematical, philosophical and medical treatises.[54]

We can conclude that it is most likely that the translation is falsely attributed to the fourteenth-century translator Nicolaus Reginus. The available information on this Nicolaus Reginus does not refer to a Constabulus or Costa ben Luca. Nicolaus Reginus is probably called the disciple (follower) of Costa ben Luca because, like Costa ben Luca, he was a physician and a translator of medical writings. If we assume that "Nicholaus Reginus" refers to the fourteenth-century translator, this implies that the attribution in manuscript *Su* and the text of *De sensu* in that manuscript, if they were written by the same hand, should be dated to the (early) fourteenth century.

* * *

[53] See F. LO PARCO, *Niccolò da Reggio grecista italiota del sec. XIV e l'interpretazione dell'epigrafe greca del tempio dei Dioscuri di Napoli ricordata dalla "*Cronaca di Parthenope*"*, Napoli 1909; IDEM, "Niccolò da Reggio Antesignano del Risorgimento dell'antichità ellenica nel secolo XIV da Codici delle Biblioteche italiane e straniere e da documenti e stampe rare", in *Atti della Reale Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti della Societa reale di Napoli* 2 (1913), 241-317. L. THORNDIKE, "Translations of Works of Galen from the Greek by Niccolo da Reggio (c.1308-1345)", in *Byzantina metabyzantina* 1 (1946), 213-35; G. SARTON, *Introduction to the History of Science*. III.1: *Science and Learning in the Fourteenth Century*, Baltimore 1947, 446-48; R. WEISS, "The Translators from the Greek of the Angevin Court of Naples", in *Rinascimento* 1 (1950), 195-226, esp. 216-25. For a recent bibliography on Nicholaus de Reggio, see C.J. LARRAIN, "Galen, *De motibus dubiis*: Die Lateinische Übersetzung des Niccolò da Reggio", in *Traditio* 49 (1994), 171-233, esp. notes on 171-72.

[54] On Costa ben Luca, see E.R. HARVEY, "Qustā ibn Lūqā al-baʿlabakkī", in *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* 11 (1975), 244-46; H.H. LAUER, "Qusta ibn Luqa", in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 7 (1995), 378.

III. David of Dinant

David of Dinant,[55] who was a *Magister* before 1210, probably in the Faculty of Arts at Paris, was the author of the *Quaternuli* or *Liber Tomi*(?). This work, of which only fragments remain, consisted of several parts and dealt with physical topics. In 1210 the Provincial Synod of Paris condemned the *Quaternuli* to be burned. According to Albert the Great, David defended the heretical theory that there are three principles of all beings, namely God, matter and intellect, and that these principles are identical. The main sources of the *Quaternuli* are the Greek Aristotelian scientific and natural philosophical treatises—he uses about twenty Aristotelian treatises, among which is the *Metaphysica*—and Greek medical texts. David assimilated the Aristotelian physical writings, summarized and explained selected texts and used them as material for his own theories. He is one of the first and main mediators of pure Aristotelian natural philosophy at the beginning of its reception in the Latin West. The excerpts of Aristotelian texts that are quoted or paraphrased in the *Quaternuli* (e.g., *De generatione et corruptione*, *Meteora*, *De generatione animalium*, *Problemata*) were translated from the Greek by David of Dinant himself during the last decades of the twelfth century. Even his quotations of texts of which there was already a Greek-Latin translation available in the twelfth century (e.g., *De anima*, *De somno, De insomniis*, *De divinatione per somnum*) are based on his own translation. His translations, which are free (not word-by-word) and contain at the same time explanations and interpretations, testify to his excellent knowledge of the Greek language and his intelligent understanding of the content of the texts. It is not known whether he translated only the excerpts of the Aristotelian texts contained in the *Quaternuli* or whether he translated larger parts or entire treatises. It seems likely that he translated or paraphrased the entire *Problemata* or larger parts of that work, which was his preferred source.

[55] My discussion of David of Dinant is based on E. CASADEI, "David di Dinant traduttore di Aristotele", in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 45 (1998), 381-406; H. ANZULEWICZ, "Person und Werk des David von Dinant im literarischen Zeugnis Alberst des Grossen", in *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 34 (2001), 15-58 (this study contains a survey of the recent scholarly literature on David of Dinant and an extensive bibliography); IDEM, "David von Dinant und die Anfänge der aristotelischen Naturphilosophie im Lateinischen Westen", in *Albertus Magnus und die Anfänge der Aristoteles-Rezeption im lateinischen Mittelalter. Von Richardus Rufus bis zu Franciscus de Mayronis*, hrsg. v. L. HONNEFELDER, R. WOOD, M. DREYER und M.-A. ARIS (Subsidia Albertina I), Münster i.W. 2005, 71-112; G. VUILLEMIN-DIEM, "Zum Aristoteles Latinus in den Fragmenten der *Quaternuli* des David von Dinant", in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 70 (2003), 27-136.

I argue that David of Dinant cannot be the anonymous author of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*. First I shall show that the quotations of *De sensu* in David's *Quaternuli* differ significantly from the parallel passages in the *Translatio vetus*. Then I shall show that David's characteristic translations do not correspond with the vocabulary of the *Translatio vetus*.

Some fragments of the *Quaternuli* contain quotations or paraphrases of Aristotle's *De sensu* that are based on David's own translation and assimilation of the Greek *De sensu*. Because the dating of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* is uncertain, we do not know whether it was made before or after David of Dinant's (partial or entire) translation of *De sensu*. I have compared the fragments of David's translation of *De sensu* with the corresponding passages of the *Translatio vetus*. This comparison shows that the two translations differ greatly and hence do not depend on each another.

In the following survey, I discuss only the passages of the *Quaternuli* that must be based on *De sensu* (i.e., that cannot be based on another Aristotelian text). Most of these passages are part of David's discussion of sight.[56] The titles refer to parts of the *Quaternuli* and are based on David's testimony (*Liber de effectibus colere nigre....*), on Albert the Great's testimony (*Liber de visu*) or are added by the editor (*De iride, De luce*), M. Kurdziałek.[57] The similarities between David's text and the *Translatio vetus* are indicated in italics, the differences in bold.

> *Liber de effectibus colere nigre in homine et de multis aliis dubiis determinatis per Aristotilem, Fragmentum G* (= Gent, Bibliotheek van de Rijksuniversiteit, Hs. 5), ed. Kurdziałek, 14.5-8: Quod autem oculi sunt **aquei**, **patet**, quia, si *corrumpuntur*, **effluit** ex eis multa aqua. Est autem aqua oculi non simplex, sed **pinguis**, **ne possit facile per frigus congelari**; et inde est, ut ait Aristoteles, quod nemo unquam in oculis frigus passus est; pinguedo non **congelatur a frigore**, cum sit ex aere.
>
> *De sensu* (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (438a16-24): ....quare pupilla et oculus **aque** sunt. Hoc autem et in ipsis operibus **manifestum**; videtur enim aqua quod **discurrit** *corruptis* oculis,... Et album oculi in habentibus sanguinem **plus est**[58] et crassius;

[56] On David's theory of sight, see A. SPEER, "Von Plato zu Aristoteles. Zur Prinzipienlehre bei David von Dinant", in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 47 (2000), 307-41, esp. 321-22; ANZULEWICZ, "David von Dinant", 102-4.

[57] DAVIDIS DE DINANTO *Quaternulorum Fragmenta*, ed. M. KURDZIAŁEK (Studia Mediewistyczne 3), Warszawa 1963.

[58] The difference between the translation *pinguis* (David of Dinant) and *plus* (*Translatio vetus*) corresponds to variants in the Greek tradition: πῖον] *ρθm*^{a} *(ex* πλεῖον *corr.) P* : πλεῖον *EYC*^{c}*Mim*^{b}. See D. BLOCH, "The Manuscripts of the *De Sensu* and the *De Memoria:* Preliminary Texts and Full Collations", in *Cahiers de l'institut du moyen-âge grec et latin* 75 (2004), 7-119, esp. 56. For more information on these variants, see GALLE, "The Dating and Earliest Reception", 28-29.

quod ideo est, **ut permaneat** humidum **incoagulatum**. Et ideo corporis infrigidabile est oculus; numquam enim id quod infra palpebras est, **infrigidatur**.

Liber de visu, *Fragmentum G*, ed. Kurdziałek, 40.18-25 (almost identical with *Fragmentum P* (= Paris, BNF, Ms. lat. 15453), ed. Kurdziałek, 66.12-19):[59] Unde cristallinus humor oculi, ut ait Aristoteles, qui instrumentum est visus, nichil aliud est quam aqua condensata. Et est humor ille **diafanes** id est translucens in modum cristalli. Ideoque, ut ait Aristoteles, si *corrumpatur* oculus, videtur **ex eo fluere** multa aqua. Dicit autem Plato visum esse ex igne oculumque **emittere lucem** a se ad rem visam lucemque esse corpus. Cui Aristoteles repugnat probans quidem, quod visus est ex aqua et quod oculus recipiat lucem a re visa et quod lux non sit corpus, sed color passivus. Sed querit aliquis: quod si oculus videat colores contrarios, numquid idem contrariis coloribus afficiatur?[60]

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (438a12-18): Quod visus namque est aque, verum quidem, non autem accidit videre secundum quod est aqua, sed secundum quod est **perspicuum**;... quare pupilla et oculus aque sunt.... videtur enim aqua quod **discurrit** *corruptis* oculis,...

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (437b9-13): Ille autem se ipsum videt oculus, quemadmodum et in refractione. Si enim ignis esset, ut dicit Empedocles et in Thimeo scribitur, et accideret videre **exeunte** quemadmodum a lucerna **lumine**,...

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (438b5-11): Et rationabiliter quod interius aque est; perspicua enim aqua; videtur autem sicut exterius non sine lumine, ita et interius; **perspicuum** ergo oportet esse. Et necesse est aquam esse, quoniam non est aer.... Quare necessario perspicuum est et receptibile luminis quod interius oculi.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (439a18-19): Quemadmodum ergo dictum est de lumine in illis, quod sit color perspicui secundum accidens....

Liber de visu, Fragmentum G, ed. Kurdziałek, 40.33-34: **Dubitabile est** *autem*, utrum *oculus videat se***ipsum** et videndo seipsum quandoquidem videt colorem passivum, secundum quem alteratus est.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (437a26-29): **Habet** *autem* et hoc **aliam obiectionem**. Si enim non est latere sentientem et videntem visibile quid, necesse est enim *se videre oculum*.

<*De iride*>, *Fragmentum G*, ed. Kurdziałek, 53.18-21: Ostensum est alias radium (*coni.*: radius *ed.*) cristallini humoris nullatenus *exire* ab oculo, cum non sit ex igne, sed ex aqua. Aqua autem propriam lucem non habet. Oculus, in quo fit visus, nullam <lucem> **a se emittit**, sed exterioris **lucis susceptivus** est. Nam et si *corrumpatur*

[59] The preceding sentence (*Quaternuli* G 40.17-18; P 66. 12: "Nam cum oculus sit ex aqua, susceptivus quidem est colorum quemadmodum et aqua.") could be based on *De gen. an.* V.1 (779b.20-25); see also *Quaternuli* 9. 25-28.

[60] This excerpt is discussed and compared with the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* by VUILLEMIN-DIEM, "Zum Aristoteles Latinus", 123-24. She points to the fact that David translates διαφανὲς with *diafanes, id est translucens*, and not with *perspicuum*, the translation in the *Translatio vetus*. The translation of διά by *trans* is characteristic of David. See also VUILLEMIN-DIEM, "Zum Aristoteles Latinus", 135.

oculus noster, **ex eo fluit** aqua multa.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (437b10-13; 23-25): Si enim ignis esset, ut dicit Empedocles et in Thimeo scribitur, et accideret videre *exeunte* quemadmodum a lucerna lumine,... Nunc autem nichil tale accidit. Empedocles autem videtur estimare quod *exeunte* lumine, sicut dictum est prius, videre.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (438a16; 25-26; b10-11): quare pupilla et oculus aque sunt.... Irrationabile autem omnino est quod **exeunte** ab aliquo visum videre et extendi usque ad astra.... Quare necessario perspicuum est et **receptibile luminis** quod interius oculi.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (438a17): videtur enim aqua quod **discurrit** *corruptis* oculis,...

<*De iride*>, *Fragmentum G*, ed. Kurdziałek, 53.26-27: Nituntur autem quidam probare visum esse ex igne ex eo, quod **si comprimamus** oculum in umbra, videmus quidem radium ab oculo provenire.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 2 (437a24-26): Faciunt autem omnes visum ignis, quia passionis cuiusdam ignorant causam; **constricto** enim et moto oculo videtur ignem lucere;

<*De luce*>, *Fragmentum W* (= Wien, ÖNB, Cod. 4753) ed. Kurdziałek, 85.20-21: que **dyaphania** *non est proprium aque* nec *aeris nec* **predictorum**, *sed communis* **phisis** *et virtus*, *que* **separabilis** *non est*.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 3 (439a21-23): ....quod autem dicimus **perspicuum**, *non est proprium aeri* vel *aque, nec* **alicui sic dictorum corporum**, *sed* quedam est *communis* **natura** *et virtus*, *que* **separata** quidem *non est*,...

<*De luce*>, *Fragmentum W*, ed. Kurdziałek, 85.27-28: Est igitur **lux** color **dyaphani** *secundum accidens*. Prima enim luminosi <causa est presentia> **lucis** in **dyaphano**, *privacio vero* causa est *umbre* et *tenebrarum*.

Fragmentum W, ed. Kurdziałek, 85-86.32-2: Dixit enim Aristoteles, quod *umbra* non est color nec opponitur luci ut contrarium, sed privacio, ut dicit: Umbra non est color, sed privacio lucis.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 3 (439a18-21): Quemadmodum ergo dictum est de **lumine** in illis, quod sit color **perspicui** *secundum accidens* - quando enim inest aliquid ignitum in **perspicuo**, presentia quidem **lumen** est, *privatio vero tenebre*;

Fragmentum W, ed. Kurdziałek, 85.30-31: ....nam dicit Aristoteles: **Sicut** *nigrum est privacio albi in* **dyaphano**, **sic** *salsum et amarum dulcis in humido*.

De sensu (*Translatio vetus*) 4 (442a25-27): Et **quemadmodum** *nigrum privatio est in* **perspicuo** albi, **ita** *amarum et salsum dulcis in* nutrimenti *humido*.

Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem has shown that David of Dinant cannot be identified with one of the anonymous Greek-Latin translators of Aristotle's treatises, among which is the translator of *De sensu*.[61] The following table presents a complete comparison of David's characteristic translations of some

[61] See VUILLEMIN-DIEM, "Zum Aristoteles Latinus", 27-136, esp. 135.

particles and significant substantives, adjectives, verbs, etc., listed by Vuillemin-Diem,[62] and the translations in the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*.[63] It proves that David of Dinant cannot be the unknown translator of *De sensu*.

Similarities: between David's translations and the translations of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*: δῆλον (manifestum); ἐπεὶ (quoniam); ἔτι (amplius)

Differences:

	David	*De sensu*
γὰρ	nam	enim (122), namque (7), *om.* (2)
δέ	vero	autem (177), vero (68), *om.* (9), ...
διό	unde	quare, (once 'unde')
οὕτω(ς)	adeo	ita, sic, taliter, similiter
διά + gen.	trans	per
τοιοῦτος	huiusmodi	talis
διαφανὲς	translucens, transparans	perspicuum
λαμπρὸν	lucidum	Cf. λαμπρότης: claritas
πνευματώδης	fumosus, fumositas	spiritualis
πολλοί	quamplures	multi
φοινικοῦν	rubeum	puniceum
αἰσθητήριον	instrumentum sensus / visus	instrumentum (11), instrumentum sensuum (1)
δύναμις	vis	virtus
εἴδωλον	ymago	ydolum
νόσος	morbus	infirmitas
πόρος	meatus	porus
φῶς	lux	lumen (21), lux (2), lucidus (1)
δύναμαι	valeo	possum

* * *

IV. Other Greek-Latin Translators of Aristotle

Could the translator of *De sensu* be identified with a known or anonymous translator of other Aristotelian treatises? A comparison of the idiom of the translator of *De sensu* with the idiom of the other Greek-Latin translators of Aristotelian works shows that the translator cannot be identified with any of them. I have compared the vocabulary on the basis of the lists made by Minio-Paluello (mainly particles and conjunctions) and on the basis of more recent studies of the idiom of the translators and the indices of the editions of Latin translations of Aristotle's works. As far as possible, my comparisons follow the chronological order in which the translations were made.[64]

[62] See VUILLEMIN-DIEM, "Zum Aristoteles Latinus", 133, 135.

[63] Vuillemin Diem's table (135) includes only a few comparisons between David's vocabulary and the vocabulary of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*.

[64] For the attribution of a translation to a certain author and for its dating, see J. BRAMS, *La*

The table presents the Greek-Latin translations in *De sensu* of words that in the following survey have frequently been compared with translations in other Aristotelian treatises. The translations correspond with those mentioned in the Greek-Latin index of the edition of *De sensu*. (For some words, variant translations have been recorded in the table.) For some translations, the critical apparatus refers many times to alternative readings in some manuscripts, which have not been mentioned in the table.

ἀλλα	sed (56), nichil ... nisi (1)
ἄδηλον	inmanifestum (3)
ἅμα	simul (33)
ἄν	utique (19), *om.* (10)
ἆρα	an (2)
ἆρ᾽ οὖν	ergo (2) ; an ergo (1)
ἄρα	ergo (12)
γὰρ	almost always ‘enim’ (122), sometimes ‘namque’ (7), *om.* (2)
γὰρ καὶ	437a26: etenim et (enim et *BwWo*; etiam *Vü*)
καὶ γὰρ	etenim (8)
γοῦν	437b22: enim (autem *WoSu*); 442b14: ergo (vero *Bw*)
εἰ δέ	etsi (1)
δέ	autem (177), vero (68), *om.* (9), enim (4), et (2), etiam (2), sed (2), ergo (1), verum (1)
δὴ	*om.* (8), enim (3), ita(que) (1), itaque (?1), quidem/ergo (1), igitur/ergo (?1)
δῆλον	manifestum (20)
διά τί	quare
διά τοῦτο	ideo (3)
διό	quare (17), unde (1)
εἴπερ	si (3)
ἕκαστος	unusquisque (19), quilibet (1)
ἐκει	ibi (4)
ἐπεί	quoniam (9), enim (1)
ἐπειδή	quoniam (2)
ἕτερος	alius (18), alter (8)
ἔτι	amplius (17), adhuc (1) , etiam/ autem (1), *om.* (1)
εὐθυς	statim (1), subito (1)
ἤ	vel (30), aut (4), et (1), nisi (1)
ἢ... ἢ...	vel... vel (4), aut... aut (2), aut... vel (1)
ᾗ	secundum quod (est)
ἴσως	equaliter (1), forte (2)
καί	et (337), *om.*, vel (2), etiam (1)
καίτοι	quamvis (4), etenim (1)
οἱ λοιποί	reliqui (2)
μέν	quidem (60), *om.* (15), enim (1), quoque (?1)

riscoperta di Aristotele in Occidente, Milano 2003, and the literature quoted there.

μὲν γὰρ	enim (18), once 'namque' (1)
μὲν οὖν	ergo (11), autem (7), enim (2), siquidem (2), vero (2), igitur (1), itaque (2), namque (1)
οἷον	velud (17), quemadmodum (16), veluti (2), quasi (1), scilicet (1)
ὅλως	omnino (10)
ὅς	qui (28)
ὅστις	qui (1), quis? (1)
ὅταν	quando (13)
ὅτι	quoniam (29), quod (8), quia (5)
οὐ(κ) - μή	non (95), minime (2) - non (31), minime (1)
οὐ μὴν ἀλλά	necnon sed (1)
οὖν	ergo (10), enim (443b2)
οὕτω(ς)	sic (14), ita (11), taliter, similiter
πάλιν	rursum (1)
πᾶς	omnis (43), quilibet (1)
πλήν	nisi (1)
πῶς	quomodo (9), quo modo (2)
σχεδόν	fere (5)
τε	*om.* (8), autem (1), quoque (1), et (1)
τε καί	et (3)
τοίνυν	ergo (2), *om.* (after μὲν: 441a21)
τοιοῦτος	talis (17)
φανερόν	manifestum (7)
ὄν	existens (20)
ὡς	sicut (11), ut (5), quod (2), ita ut (1), quare (1), quemadmodum (1), quomodo (1)
ὥσπερ, καθάπερ	quemadmodum (26), sicut (18)
ὥστε	quare (23), ita quod (1), igitur (1)

Below I record the similarities and differences between the translations of *De sensu* and other Aristotelian treatises; I give the Latin translation from the work with which I compare the translation in *De sensu*; the translation without brackets is the frequent translation, the one between parentheses is less frequent, and the one between square brackets is rare. The translations in *De sensu* that are not recorded in the table above are here cited as (*DS*).

BOETHIUS' translations of *Porphyrii Isagogè, Categoriae, De interpretatione, Analytica priora, Topica, De sophisticis elenchis*:[65]

Similarities: ἔτι; ἤ; ὅταν; τε; ὥστε
Differences: γὰρ: enim (nam); δή: ergo, igitur; μὲν γὰρ: enim (preference), nam, nam quidem; μὲν οὖν: frequently 'ergo' or 'igitur'; ὅτι: almost always 'quoniam'; οὖν: frequently 'ergo', sometimes 'igitur'; ᾗ: (in) eo quod.

[65] See list in L. MINIO-PALUELLO, "Iacobus Veneticus Grecus: Canonist and Translator of Aristotle", in *Traditio* 8 (1952), 265-304; reprt. MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula*, 189-228, esp. 207, 213.

The translations of IACOBUS VENETICUS, made between 1125 and 1150: James of Venice translated some of the *Parva naturalia*, namely *De memoria et reminiscentia, De longitudine et brevitate vite, De iuventute et senectute, De respiratione* and *De morte et vita*. Since he translated some of the other *Parva naturalia*, he is an important candidate for the authorship of the translation of *De sensu*. Here I compare the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* with (parts of) James of Venice's translations of the *Analytica posteriora*, *Physica vetus, De anima, De memoria et reminiscentia*, *De iuventute et senectute, De morte et vita et de respiratione* and the *Metaphysica vetustissima*.[66] The comparison convincingly shows that James is not the translator of *De sensu*:

Similarities: δῆλον; ἐπεὶ; ἔτι; ὅλως; ὥστε
Differences: ἄρα: mostly 'itaque'; δὴ: igitur (*om.*), [autem.…]; διό: unde, [ex quo], only once 'quare'; ἕτερος: alter, [alius]; ἤ: aut, [once 'vel']; μὲν γὰρ: quidem enim, enim quidem; μὲν οὖν: quidem igitur; οἷον: ut (sicut, tamquam, sic); ὅταν: cum [quando]; ὅτι: quod, quoniam, (quia); οὖν: igitur; πάλιν: iterum; τε: -que, *om.* (et); τοιοῦτος: huiusmodi, (talis), [huiuscemodi]; ὥσπερ and καθάπερ: sicut, [quemadmodum...]

The translations by BURGUNDIUS PISANUS of the *Ethica nicomachea* (= *Ethica vetus* (Lib. II-III), *Ethica nova* (Lib. I), *Hoferiana* (extracts Lib. II-VIII) and *Borghesiana* (Lib. VII-VIII] and of *De generatione et corruptione*,[67] before ca. 1150:

Similarities: δῆλον; ἐπεὶ; οὕτω(ς); ὅταν; τοιοῦτος
Differences: γὰρ: never 'namque'; διό: ideo; δὴ: utique; οἷον: verbi gratia; (puta), [ut puta....]; μὲν γὰρ: quidem enim; μὲν οὖν: quidem igitur; οἷον: almost never 'quemadmodum'; οὖν: mostly 'igitur'; ὥστε: quapropter [quare, ut, quod]

The words ἀπορέω and ἀπορία are never translated 'obicio' and 'obiectio', which are translations found in *DS*; διακρίνω: segrego, diiudico (*DS*: discerno); δύναμις: mostly 'potentia' (*DS*: virtus); οἴομαι: existimo, estimo (*DS*: puto)

---

[66] See the list in MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula*, 207, 209-11; see also the list in K. HULSTAERT, ARISTOTELES LATINUS. *De iuventute et senectute, de morte et vita et de respiratione. Translatio vetus, Voorbereiding voor een kritische editie*, supervisor: J. BRAMS, licentieverhandeling Leuven 1999 (unpublished), xxxvii-xl.

[67] List of the translations in *De generatione et corruptione* and *Ethica Nicomachea* in MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula*, 213; F. BOSSIER, "L'élaboration du vocabulaire philosophique chez Burgundio de Pise", in *Aux origines du lexique philosophique européen : l'influence de la "latinitas"*, éd. J. HAMESSE (Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 8), Louvain-la-Neuve 1997, 81-116. See also the list of the translations in *De generatione et corruptione*, in R.J. DURLING, "The Anonymous Translation of Aristotle's *De generatione et corruptione* (*Translatio Vetus*)", in *Traditio* 49 (1994), 320-30. Some of these translations have been compared with the indices to the edition of the *Ethica Nicomachea*: *Ethica Nicomachea: Indices verborum*, ed. R.-A. GAUTHIER (AL XI XXVI/$^{1-3}$ fasc. 5), Leiden-Bruxelles 1973.

Furthermore, the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* has almost none of the characteristics, described by F. Bossier, of Burgundio's translations of the *Ethica Nicomachea*, *De generatione et corruptione* and of several other works.[68] *De sensu* does not share with Burgundio's translations the double translations *sensibilis*/*sensatus* (for αἰσθητός),[69] *desiderium*/*concupiscentia* (for ἐπιθυμία), *amplius*/*adhuc*, *generari*/*fieri*.

The translation of *Meteora* IV by HENRICUS ARISTIPPUS**,**[70] a Sicilian translator who died in 1162:

Similarities (but not convincing): ἐπεί; ὅτι: quoniam, (quia), [quod]; οἷον: quemadmodum, (velut); [ut,...]
Differences: διό: idcirco, (ideo....); ἔτι: adhuc, (amplius); ὅταν: cum, quotiens, (quando); οὖν: igitur, (ergo, itaque); πάλιν: preference for 'iterum'

The Anonymous translation of the *Analytica priora* and the *Topica* (first half of twelfth century),[71] preserved in the manuscript Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, Ms. 4228:

Similarities: οἷον: velut, [ut]; οὖν
Differences: γὰρ: enim, (siquidem); δέ: vero; δῆλον: liquet, (manifestum [est]); μὲν γὰρ: siquidem; μέντοι: tamen; οὕτω(ς): ita; πάλιν: rursus; ὅτι: quoniam, (quia); ὥστε: itaque; δύναμις: potentia (vis, facultas) (*DS*: virtus); λαμβάνω: accipio, (sumo) (*DS*: recipio, sumo); νόσος: languor (*DS*: infirmitas)

The translation of the *Analytica posteriora***,** attributed to a certain IOANNUS, made later than the translations by James of Venice but before 1159, and preserved in the manuscript Toledo, Biblioteca del Cabildo, Ms.17-14:[72]

Similarities: δέ, δῆλον, ἔτι, ὅταν, ὅτι, τοιοῦτος
Differences: γὰρ: enim, (etenim), [nam]; διό: propter quod; οἷον: sicut; οὖν: igitur; οὕτω(ς): ita, (sic); πάλιν (rursus); τε: et, (*om.*)

The Anonymous translation of the *Physica Vaticana* and the *Meta-*

[68] See BOSSIER, "L'élaboration". Bossier has investigated BURGUNDIO OF PISA's translations of IOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Commentarius in sanctum Matthaeum evangelistam* and *Commentarius in sanctum Joannem apostolum et evangelistam* (incomplete text of Arras, BM, Ms. 1083); IOANNES DAMASCENUS, *De fide orthodoxa*; NEMESIUS EMESENUS, *De natura hominis*; GALENUS, *De complexionibus*, *De interioribus* and *De regimine sanitatis*.

[69] In *De sensu* αἰσθητός is translated 30 times as *sensibilis*. In two cases (446a17, b3) MS *Bm* has the variant *sensitivus* instead of *sensibilis*. In 439a6 MS *Bw* has *sensualis* instead of *sensibilis*.

[70] List by MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula*, 213.

[71] List by MINIO-PALUELLO (ed.) in the Introduction to *Analytica Priora. Translatio Boethii (recensiones duae): Translatio Anonyma, Pseudo-Philoponi aliorumque scholia. Specimina translationum recentiorum*, editio altera (AL $XI^{III/1-4}$), Leiden-New York-Köln 1998, lxxi. Indices in *Analytica Priora* and *Topica. Translatio Boethii, Fragmentum recensionis alterius et Translatio anonyma* (AL V^{1-3}), ed. L. MINIO-PALUELLO et B.G. DOD, Bruxelles-Paris 1969.

[72] See the list by MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula*, 213, 386.

physica media (before 1200):[73]

Similarities: μὲν; διά τί; ἐπεὶ; ἔτι; οὕτως; σχεδόν
Differences: ἄν + opt.: never translated; γὰρ: enim, (nam, namque); δὴ: *om.* (autem, vero); δῆλον: palam; διό: quapropter; εἰ δέ: quodsi, si vero; ἕτερος: diversus, (alter, alius); ἤ: aut, (vel); ᾗ: in quantum; οἷον: ut; ὅτι: quia; φανερόν: palam, manifestum; ὤν: ens, [existens]; ὡς: ut, (quasi), [quia, tamquam, sicut]

The words ἀπορέω and ἀπορία are translated: dubito, dubitatio (*DS*: obicio, obiectio); ἄτοπος: absurdus, inconveniens (*DS*: incongruus); βέλτιον: dignius (*DS*: melius); δύναμις: potestas, potentia (*DS*: virtus); ενδέχεται: contingit (*DS*: convenit, oportet); λανθάνω: obliviscor (*DS*: decipio, fallo, lateo); μέγεθος: mensura (*DS*: magnitudo); σπέρμα: sperma (*DS*: semen); τυγχάνω: sortior (*DS*: existo)

The anonymous translator of *De somno et vigilia* and *De insomniis et de divinatione per somnum* (second half of the twelfth century).[74] Because these two treatises belong to the *Parva naturalia*, this anonymous translator deserves special attention. An extensive comparison of the lexicon shows that he is not the translator of *De sensu*:

Similarities: δέ, δῆλον and φανερόν; ἐπεὶ; ἔτι; ἤ; καθάπερ; ὅλως; εἴδωλον (ydolum); ἔμβρυον (embrium); ἔναιμοι (sanguinem habentes); πόρος (porus); φαντασία (fantasia)
Differences: γὰρ: never 'namque'; δή: preference for 'quidem'; διό: ideo; ἕτερος: alius, (diversus); μὲν οὖν: quidem igitur, (igitur); οἷον: velud, (ut); τοιοῦτος: mainly 'huiusmodi'; τε: quidem, (*om.*)

αἰσθάνομαι: sentio, twice 'percipio' (*DS*: sentio[r]; αἰσθητήριον: organum sentiendi (*DS*: instrumentum [sensuum]); αἰσθητικός: only 'sensibilis' (*DS*: sensibilis, sensualis); το ἁπτικόν: apticon (*DS*: tactuale); δεκτικός: susceptibilis (*DS*: receptibilis); δοκέω: videor (*DS*: puto, videor); δύναμις: potentia, potestas (*DS*: virtus); ἔντομος: intersectus (*DS*: enthomus); θερμότης: caliditas (*DS*: calor); θεωρέω: speculor (2), inspicio (1) (*DS*: considero, video); μεταβάλλω: permuto (*DS*: commutor, moveor, transmutor); μόριον: particula (*DS*: pars); νόσος: egritudo (*DS*: infirmitas); ὀστρακόδερμα: qui durum habent corium (*DS*: ὀστρακόδερμος: duripellis); πρᾶξις: actus, (actio) (*DS*: operatio); σκληρός: durus (*DS*: asper); φυσικός: naturalis (*DS*: phisicus)

---

[73] See the lists in L. MINIO-PALUELLO, "Note sull'Aristotele Latino medievale II. Caratteristiche del traduttore della *Physica Vaticana* e della *Metaphysica Media* (Gerardo di Cremona?)", in *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 42 (1950), 226-31 (=*Opuscula*, 102-7). Minio-Paluello has compared the entire *Physica Vaticana* with *Metaphysica Media* X (from 1055a20), XI and XII (to 1080b31); G. VUILLEMIN-DIEM, "Jakob von Venedig und der Übersetzer der *Physica Vaticana* und *Metaphysica Media*", in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 41 (1974), 7-25, esp. 8 n. 2.

[74] See the lists in ARISTOTELES, *De somno et vigilia liber adiectis veteribus translationibus et Theodori Metochitae commentario*, ed. H.J. DROSSAART LULOFS (Templum Salomonis), Leiden 1943, XIII-XIX (Introduction); 38-45 (index); ARISTOTELES, *De insomniis et de divinatione per somnum: A New Edition of the Greek Text with the Latin Translations* 2. *Translations, index verborum*, ed. H.J. DROSSAART LULOFS, Leiden 1947, 49-67 (index); MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula* 213.

The translator of *De sensu* shares some characteristics with the Anonymous translator of the *Rhetorica* (before 1250).[75] Neither translator possessed an excellent knowledge of the Greek language, they sometimes misinterpreted Aristotle's text and they translated the particles and conjunctions inconsistently.[76] A comparison of the translations of particles and other frequent words, however, shows that the translator of the *Rhetorica* cannot be identified with the translator of *De sensu*:

Similarities: γὰρ; δέ; ἐπεὶ; ἕτερος; ἔτι; ὅτι; ὥστε
Differences: διό: ideoque, ideo; οἷον: ut, (ut puta, tamquam); δή: utique, (autem); οὖν: igitur; ἤ: aut; μὲν οὖν: autem, (vero), ...; πάλιν: iterum, (rursus); οὕτω(ς): sic; τοιοῦτος: huiusmodi, hic, talis

The lost Anonymous translation of *De motu animalium*, used by Albert the Great in his paraphrase *De principiis motus processivi* and probably translated during the first half of the thirteenth century in Southern Italy:[77]

Similarities: γὰρ; δῆλον
Differences: δή: utique; ἕκαστος: singulus, singuli, (singularis); ὥσπερ, καθάπερ: sicut (11), quemadmodum (4); ὥστε: ideo, igitur, (ergo, sic, ut)

ἀκολουθέω: consequor (*DS*: insequor); ἀπορέω and ἀπορία: quero and questio (*DS*: obicio and obiectio); ἄτοπος: inconveniens (*DS*: incongruus); δέομαι: indigeo (*DS*: egeo); δημιουργέω: causo (*DS*: construo, genero); δύναμις: potentia, virtus, (fortitudo, passio) (*DS*: virtus); ἐνδέχεται: contingit (*DS*: convenit, oportet); ἠρεμέω: sto, (stabilis).... (*DS*: quiesco); λόγος: ratio (*DS*: proportio, sermo); ὄρεξις: desiderium, appetitus (impetus, voluntas) (*DS*: appetitus); οἴομαι: opinor, arbitror (*DS*: puto); πέρας: finis (*DS*: extremitas); πορεύομαι: ambulo (*DS*: transeo)

The Anonymous *Translatio vetus* of the *Oeconomica*, probably made by a Southern Italian in the thirteenth century before the 1260s:[78]

Similarities: ὅταν
Differences: γὰρ: almost always 'enim'; δῆλον: patet; διό: propter quod; ἐπεί: mostly 'cum'; ἤ: aut; οἷον: mostly 'ut'; ὅτι: almost always 'quod'; οὖν: mostly 'igitur'; πάλιν: iterum; ὥσπερ and καθάπερ: mostly 'sicut'

---

[75] See Particles in indices in ARISTOTLES, *Rhetorica. Translatio anonyma sive vetus et Translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka* (AL XXXI[1-2]), ed. B. SCHNEIDER, Leiden 1978. On the date of the translation, see the Introduction by B. SCHNEIDER in *Rhetorica* (AL XXXI[1-2]), xiii.

[76] For these characteristics of the translation of the *Rhetorica*, see the the Introduction by SCHNEIDER, *Rhetorica* (AL XXXI[1-2]), xiii-xvi.

[77] See indices to the reconstruction of this translation in *De motu animalium: Fragmenta translationis anonymae*, ed. P. DE LEEMANS (AL XVII.1.3), Turnhout, forthcoming.

[78] I have compared the idiom of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* with the indices of the *Translatio vetus* of the *Oeconomica* I-II (The *Translatio vetus* contains three books, but the third book has not been preserved in Greek). I am grateful to C. FLÜELER for sending me his preparation of the Greek-Latin indices and of the Introduction to the edition of the *Translatio vetus* of the *Oeconomica*.

Because the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* seems to predate 1232, it is unlikely that ROBERTUS GROSSETESTE is the translator. According to J. McEvoy, Grosseteste started to learn Greek in the years 1220,[79] but he could scarcely have begun to translate independently before ca. 1237.[80] He translated Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachea* and the Greek commentaries on it from ca. 1236 until ca. 1246.[81] A comparison between translations of the particles in the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* and in Grosseteste's translations of *De celo* II, *Ethica* (sections of Books IV and X) and *De lineis insecabilis*[82] shows that Grosseteste is not the anonymous translator of *De sensu*:

Similarities: γὰρ; δῆλον; ἤ; ὅτι; πάλιν; τοιοῦτος
Differences: διό: propter quod; δή: utique; ἐπεὶ: quia; ἔτι: adhuc; οἷον: velut, puta; ὅταν: quando; οὖν: igitur; πάλιν: rursus; τε: et; ὥστε: quare, ut et

Because the activity of BARTHOLOMEUS DE MESSINA, who translated at the court of Manfred, King of Sicily, most probably can be dated between 1258 and 1266, it is unlikely that he is the translator of *De sensu*. A comparison between the idiom of the translation of *De sensu* and Bartholomew's translations of *De signis*, *De principiis*, *Problemata*, *Physiognomonia*, *De mundo* and parts of the *Magna moralia*[83] shows that he is not the translator of *De sensu*:

Similarities: ἄν, γὰρ, δέ, ἕτερος, ὅταν, τε, ὥσπερ, ὥστε
Differences: γὰρ is often not translated in μὲν γὰρ; δή: utique, (*om.*); διό: propter quod; ἤ: aut, [vel]; οἷον: ut, (puta, sicut); ὅτι: quod, quia, (quoniam); οὖν: igitur, (ergo)

The Anonymous translation of *De partibus animalium* (Padova, Biblioteca Antoniana, Ms. 370 Scaff. XVII), which is probably of Italian origin and probably predates Moerbeke's translation of *De partibus animalium*:[84]

---

[79] See J. MCEVOY, *Gli inizi di Oxford. Grossatesta e i primi teologi (1150-1250)*, Milano 1996, 100-6.

[80] See J. MCEVOY, "Questions of Authenticity and Chronology Concerning Works Attributed to Robert Grosseteste and Edited 1940-1980", in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 23 (1981), 64-86, esp. 84.

[81] See MCEVOY, "Questions of Authenticity", 73-82.

[82] See the list in MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula*, 213.

[83] See the lists in MINIO-PALUELLO, "I due traduttori medievali del *De mundo*" (see n. 24), 232-37 (= *Opuscula*, 108-13); IDEM, *Opuscula*, 213.

[84] The comparison is based on the lists of Greek-Latin translations in the first book of the anonymous translation of *De partibus animalium* in P. ROSSI, "La *translatio anonyma* e la *translatio Guillelmi* del *De partibus animalium* (analisi del libro I)", in *Guillaume de Moerbeke. Recueil d'études à l'occasion du 700e anniversaire de sa mort (1286)*, éd. J. BRAMS et W. VANHAMEL (Ancient and Medieval Philosophy. De Wulf-Mansion Centre Series I.7), Leuven 1989, 221-45, esp. 228-34.

Similarities: δέ: autem, (vero); δῆλον: manifestum (est); ἤ: vel, (aut); μὲν: quidem; τελευτάω: finio
Differences: διό: propter quod; εἴπερ: siquidem (2), si vero (1); ἐκει: illic; μὲν γὰρ: quidem igitur, quidem; μὲν οὖν: mainly 'quidem igitur'; πῶς: mainly 'qualiter'; οἷον: mainly 'ut', never 'quemadmodum'; οὖν: mostly 'igitur'; ἐπιστήμη: disciplina (*DS*: scientia); μόριον: particula (*DS*: pars); ὁρίζω: diffinio (*DS*: (de)termino); τυγχάνω: contingo, potior (*DS*: existo)

I have not compared the anonymous translation of *De sensu* with the translations of GUILLELMUS DE MOERBEKE. Moerbeke's earliest dated translation was completed in 1260,[85] while the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* already existed in 1232. Moreover, between 1260 and ca. 1268, William produced the *Translatio nova* of *De sensu*, which is a revision of the *Translatio vetus*.[86]

These comparisons indicate that the translator of *De sensu* cannot be identified with Boethius, Iacobus Veneticus, Burgundius Pisanus, Henricus Aristippus, David de Dinanto, Robertus Grosseteste, Bartholomeus de Messina or the anonymous translators of the *Analytica priora* and *Topica*, *Analytica posteriora*, *Physica Vaticana*, *Metaphysica media*, *De somno et vigilia* and *De insomniis et de divinatione per somnum*, *Rhetorica*, the lost *Translatio vetus* of *De motu animalium*, *Oeconomica* or *De partibus animalium*.

* * *

V. The Anonymous Translator of Ptolemeus and Proclus

Finally, I have compared the lexicon of *De sensu* with that of an anonymous twelfth-century translator, who made Greek-Latin translations of, among others, Ptolemeus' Μαθηματικὴ Σύνταξις (*Almagest*) and Proclus' Στοιχείωσις φυσικὴ ἢ περὶ κινήσεως (*Elementatio physica*).[87] He worked ca.

[85] Moerbeke started his activities as a translator around 1260. In 1260 he finished his translation of ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS' commentary on the *Meteora*. See W. VANHAMEL, "Biobibliographie de Guillaume de Moerbeke", in *Guillaume de Moerbeke*, éd. BRAMS et VANHAMEL, 301-83, esp. 309.

[86] Thomas Aquinas started to compose his commentary on the *Translatio nova* of *De sensu* in Rome before September 1268 and completed it in Paris in 1269. See J.-P. TORRELL, *Initiation à saint Thomas d'Aquin. Sa personne et son œuvre*, deuxième édition revue et augmentée d'une mise à jour critique et bibliographique (Vestigia 13), Fribourg (Suisse) - Paris 2002, 251-52. Hence, MOERBEKE must have made his revision of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* before September 1268. He translated the commentary on *De sensu* by Alexander of Aphrodisias between May and August 1260. See the Introduction by R.-A. GAUTHIER, in THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Sentencia libri de sensu et sensato, cuius secundus tractatus est de memoria et reminiscencia*, ed. R.-A. GAUTHIER, in *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P.M. edita* 45.2, Roma–Paris 1985, 88*-94*.

[87] F. Bossier and C. Steel suggested that I make this comparison.

1160 in Sicily in the environment of the court.[88]

The translation of Ptolemeus' *Syntaxis*:[89]

Similarities: ἀλλά: sed (11), verum (1); γὰρ: enim (24), quippe (1); δῆλον: manifestum (5); ἐπεί: quoniam (2); ἔτι: amplius (6); ὅτι: quoniam (24), quod (1); οὐ(κ) - μή: non (23), minime (7); ὥστε: quare (5)
Differences: δέ: vero (69), autem (27), verum (3), ...; δὴ: ergo (2), utique (1), quidem (1), *om.* (1); ἕτερος: alter (4); καί: et (153), -que (9), quoque (3),...; οἷον: ut (1); οὕτως: ita (15), sic (3); τοιοῦτος: huiusmodi (8), talis (5); ὥσπερ: quasi (9)

The translation of Proclus' *Elementatio physica*:[90]

Similarities: ἐπεί: quoniam (16); ἤ: vel (32), aut (6), *om.* (2); μέν: quidem (19), *om.* (12); ὅς: qui (14); ὅτι: quoniam (24), quod (4); οὖν: ergo (22), igitur (1); ὡς: sicut (8), ut (1), quoniam (1); ὥστε: quare (23)
Differences: ἀλλά: sed (24), verum (5); δέ: vero (39), autem (22), et (9), at (3),...; δὴ: autem (6), vero (4), *om.* (2); ἕτερος: alter (11); εὐθύς: directus (8); καί: et (103), -que (4), etiam (3),...; οἷον: sicut (1); οὕτως: ita (2)

* * *

VI. The Greek Exemplar of the *Translatio vetus*

I have compared the Latin *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* with the preliminary edition of the Greek *De sensu* by David Bloch. His critical apparatus contains complete collations of all extant Greek manuscripts of *De sensu* written in the period between the tenth and fourteenth centuries.[91] Bloch has also described the stemmatic relations among these manuscripts.[92] The exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* has not been preserved, but it is possible to describe to which part of the tradition it must have belonged.

There are three families in the Greek tradition of *De sensu*: α, β and γ. The Greek manuscript used as the basis for the Latin translation must have belonged to the α-family of the tradition, of which the manuscript Paris,

[88] For more information on this translator, See J.L. HEIBERG, "Noch Einmal die Mittelalterliche Ptolemaios-Übersetzung", in *Hermes. Zeitschrift für Classische Philologie* 46 (1911), 207-16; C.H. HASKINS, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, New York 1927, 155-65; H. BOESE (ed.), Introduction, in PROCLUS DIADOCHUS LYCIUS, *Elementatio Physica*, Berlin 1958, 16-20.

[89] The comparison is based on Boese's list of Greek-Latin translations of particles and other frequent words in the first seven chapters of the Latin translation of Ptolemaeus' *Almagest*; see BOESE, Introduction, in PROCLUS, *Elementatio Physica*, 17-18.

[90] See PROCLUS, *Elementatio Physica*, index on 50-56.

[91] See BLOCH, "The Manuscripts of the *De Sensu*" (see n.58), 7-38, 48-103.

[92] See D. BLOCH, "The Text of Aristotle's *De Sensu* and *De Memoria*", in *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3 (2008), forthcoming.

BNF, Ms. gr. 1853 (= *E*) is the oldest surviving manuscript. The *Translatio vetus* agrees for the most part with the readings in *E* and/or in the manuscript Paris, BNF, Ms. suppl. gr. 314 (= C^c), another manuscript of the α-family. In a few cases, the translation (or a variant reading in some of the manuscripts) is based on a Greek reading that was most probably present in ψ, the unpreserved ancestor of m^a and m^b belonging to the β-family of the tradition.

MS *E* is one of the main Aristotelian manuscripts and contains the oldest copy of *De sensu*. The plurality of marginal and interlinear glosses shows that *E* was used by many scholars over many centuries. The oldest part of the manuscript (ff. 1-344v) dates from the middle or second half of the tenth century, and was probably copied at Constantinople by four hands (*E* I, II, III and IV). The four copyists probably belonged to the same atelier, namely the atelier of Stoudios.[93] There are some indications that MS *E* was in Constantinople until the Renaissance (at the end of the fifteenth century MS *E* probably was already in Firenze).[94] *E* III has carefully copied *De sensu* on ff. 203-210 of the manuscript, which is the ancestor of the entire α-family of *De sensu*.[95]

MS C^c was copied around 1300 or in the first quarter of the fourteenth century, probably at Constantinople. The manuscript itself or its source probably belonged to the scholar Nikephoros Chumnos (ca. 1250-1327) and was given by him as a present to the learned Empress Theodora Rhaulaina.[96] MS C^c is the indirect ancestor of *M* (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Urbin. gr. 37, second half of the fourteenth century) and *i* (Paris, BNF, Ms. gr. 2032, end of the second half of the fourteenth century). MS *i*, which probably originated in Constantinople, and *M*, which originated in Constantinople, were copied by the same scribe.[97] Since *i*, an indirect copy of C^c,

---

[93] See P. MORAUX, "Le Parisinus graecus 1853 (Ms. E) d'Aristote", in *Scriptorium* 21 (1967), 17-41; A. ESCOBAR, *Die Textgeschichte der Aristotelischen Schrift ΠΕΡΙ ΕΝΥΠΝΙΩΝ. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Parva naturalia,* inauguraldisseration, Berlin 1990 (unpublished), 90-92; M. RASHED, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der aristotelischen Schrift* De generatione et corruptione (*Serta Graeca*. Beiträge zur Erforschung griechischer Texte 12), Wiesbaden 2001, 25; 35-53. Moraux argues that *E* was copied at Constantinople. Rashed holds that it was probably copied at Constantinople, but that there is no conclusive evidence for this. I thank A. Escobar for sending me a copy of his dissertation.

[94] See RASHED, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte*, 51.

[95] See BLOCH, "The Text of Aristotle's *De Sensu*".

[96] ESCOBAR, *Die Textgeschichte*, 103-5; RASHED, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte*, 27, 176-79, 182-88.

[97] See D. HARLFINGER, *Die Textgeschichte der pseudo-aristotelischen Schrift ΠΕΡΙ ΑΤΟΜΩΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΩΝ. Ein kodikologisch-kulturgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Klärung der*

was made at Constantinople, it is very likely that C^c was copied there as well. The C^cMi branch arose from an unpreserved copy of *E* (ε). On the line between *E* and C^c there must have occurred contamination (a minor process of correcting) from ψ.[98]

According to Harlfinger, MS *m* (Paris, BNF, Ms. gr. 1921; with many glosses) is, together with three manuscripts copied in the third quarter of the fourteenth century (ca. 1360) by the same scribe, part of an "edition" of the *Corpus Aristotelicum* made in Constantinople. This edition was probably based on an earlier collection connected with Nikephoros Gregoras (1290/91-1359/60).[99] *De sensu* is found twice in *m*: m^a (ff. 5r-9v: 442a24-449b4); ff. 142r-145v (436a1-442a24)) and m^b (ff. 146r-169v). Both texts have been copied from the same, contaminated exemplar ψ, the unpreserved ancestor of m^a and m^b belonging to the β-family of the tradition.[100]

As has been said, the *Translatio vetus* agrees for the most part with the readings in *E* and/or C^c. The exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* must have been a direct or indirect copy of *E*. Since C^c dates from the fourteenth century, it cannot have been the exemplar of the *Translatio vetus*, for the exemplar must be prior to ca. 1230. The translations in the *Translatio vetus* that do not agree with *E* and/or C^c are mostly in agreement with the variants in m^a and/or m^b. (MSS m^a and m^b stem from ψ, but have suffered contamination.) When the translations are not in agreement with the readings in these manuscripts, they mostly agree with the variants in one of the manuscripts that has been contaminated by ψ. Hence, the exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* must have been contaminated by ψ, and ψ must have existed before ca. 1230 (and thus prior to Nikephoros Gregoras).

We can formulate different hypotheses concerning the exemplar of the *Translatio vetus*. (1) It is possible that the exemplar should be situated on the line between *E* and C^c, after the contamination with ψ. (a) If the exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* is identical to the exemplar of C^c, one must assume that this manuscript contained double readings and that in some cases the scribe of C^c copied one of these readings, while the translator rendered another reading. (b) It is more likely that the exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* was an older copy

---

Überlieferungsverhältnisse im Corpus Aristotelicum, Amsterdam 1971, 109-11; ESCOBAR, *Die Textgeschichte*, 103-9; RASHED, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte*, 26, 30.

[98] See BLOCH, "The Text of Aristotle's *De Sensu*".

[99] J. WIESNER, "Zu den Scholien der Parva naturalia des Aristoteles", in *Proceedings of the World Congress on Aristotle (Thessaloniki, August 7-14, 1978)* I, Athens 1981, 233-37; HARLFINGER, *Die Textgeschichte*, 55-57; ESCOBAR, *Die Textgeschichte*, 180-81.

[100] See BLOCH, "The Text of Aristotle's *De Sensu*".

of *E*—in the tradition closer to *E*—than the exemplar of C^c. (2) It is also probable that the *Translatio vetus* was based on an exemplar that descended indirectly from *E*, but is not an ancestor of C^c. It is possible that the ε–branch of the tradition (which stems from *E*), after the contamination with ψ, divided in two branches: one branch with C^cMi, another branch with the lost exemplar of the *Translatio vetus*.

Does this information about the Greek exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* inform us about the translator? Because *E*, C^c and the ancestor of m^a and m^b were probably copied at Constantinople, it is likely that the manuscripts on the line between *E* and C^c were copied there as well. If one assumes that hypothesis (1a) is correct, it is probable that the exemplar and the *Translatio vetus* were made at Constantinople. (It is unlikely that this exemplar would have left Constantinople and then have been returned to serve as the exemplar of C^c.) Yet, if one assumes that hypothesis (1b) or (2) is correct, it is possible that the exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* was made at Constantinople but was taken to another place, or that the exemplar was not copied at Constantinople.

Some other Greek-Latin translations of Aristotle's physical works also seem to be based on an exemplar that is similar to C^c (but which preceded it in time). The model of James of Venice's translation of *De memoria* belongs to the α–family, and C^c could be its closest relative.[101] The exemplar of James of Venice's translation of *De iuventute, De morte* and *De respiratione* is related to C^c, *M* and the manuscript Oxford, Corpus Christi College, Ms. 108 (= *Z*; tenth century), which all belong to the same branch of the tradition. The translation of *De sensu* has more similarities with C^c and *M* (neither of which can be a copy of the other) than with *Z*.[102] According to H.

[101] See D. BLOCH, *Aristotle, De memoria et Reminiscentia: Text, Translation and Interpretive Essays*, Supervisor S. EBBESEN, Ph.D. thesis, Faculty of Humanities. University of Copenhagen 2006, 13; D. BLOCH, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection: Text, Translation, Interpretation, and Reception in Western Scholasticism* (Philosophia Antiqua 110), Leiden 2007, 13-14. Bloch has written me that he thinks that C^c is the closest relative of the exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* of *De memoria*.

[102] See the Introduction by K. HULSTAERT, in ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *De iuventute et senectute*, XCIX–CIV. Hulstaert notes that C^c and *M* have many similarities, but that where they differ the translation follows the variant of *M*. Yet she notes (CIV n. 11) that this conclusion is based only on one case (omission in C^c, where the *Translatio vetus* has no omission, like *M*) and that Siwek's information about the Greek variants in C^c and *M* is unclear. Siwek offers a list of variants that are typical for C^c; see P. SIWEK, *Les manuscrits grecs des Parva naturalia d'Aristote* (Collectio philosophica lateranensis 4), Roma 1961, 102. Yet these variants are (with one exception) also present in *M*, according to the apparatus of Bekker (which does not mention the variants of C^c). Further, there are discrepancies between Siwek's list and his own apparatus in the edition (see *Aristotelis Parva Naturalia Graece et Latine*, ed. P.

Fobes, Henricus Aristippus used a common ancestor of *E* and C^c for his translation of *Meteora* IV, and his translation contains traces of contamination from a common ancestor of the manuscripts, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Vat. gr. 258 (= *N*) and Vat. gr. 1027 (= *H*), which belong to the β-family of the tradition. As in the case of *De sensu*, the translation of *Meteora* IV occasionally agrees with *E* or with C^c alone, which is, according to Fobes, due to contamination from *N* and *H*.[103] David of Dinant used as a basis for his translations from *De Somno*, *De insomniis* and *De divinatione per somnum* an ancestor of C^c. Vuillemin-Diem argues that this translation bears witness to the fact that his exemplar, an edition adapted by Byzantine scholars, must have originated at least in the twelfth century, probably in relation to the Aristotelian studies of Michael of Ephesus or the philosophical circle around Anna Komnena.[104] Furthermore, an ancestor of C^c was the model of William of Moerbeke's translation of Alexander of Aprodisias' commentary on the *Meteora*,[105] made in Nicea in 1260.[106] That a model of C^c was used by different translators during the twelfth and thirteenth century proves that this tradition was important for the Greek-Latin translations of Aristotle's works, but it does not give us indications about the translator of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*.

* * *

Conclusion

Only one manuscript (*Su*) of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* mentions the name of a translator, namely Nicholaus Reginus. I have argued that the translator of *De sensu* cannot be identified with Nicholaus of Otranto, a

---

SIWEK, Roma 1963). Hence, a definite conclusion about the relationship of the *Translatio vetus* to C^c and *M* will only be possible on the basis of new collations of the manuscripts.

[103] See F.H. FOBES, "Mediaeval Versions of Aristotle's Meteorology", in *Classical Philology* 10 (1915), 297-314, esp. 305-7; Introduction by F.H. FOBES, in *Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Libri Quattuor*, Cambridge MA, 1919 (reprt. Hildesheim 1967), vii-viii.

[104] See VUILLEMIN-DIEM, "Zum Aristoteles Latinus" (see n. 55), 63-65, 132-33.

[105] Introduction to ALEXANDRE D'APHRODISIAS, *Commentaire sur les Météores d'Aristote : Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke*, éd. A.J. SMET (Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum IV), Leuven-Paris 1968, cxxi-cxxviii.

[106] Introduction by Smet in ALEXANDRE D'APHRODISIAS, *Commentaire sur les Météores*, xi. For general information on the Greek manuscripts that were available to the thirteenth-century translators of Aristotelian treatises, see J. BRAMS, "Traductions et traducteurs latins dans l'empire de Nicée et sous les paléologues", in *Philosophie et sciences à Byzance de 1204 à 1453. Les textes, les doctrines et leur transmission.* Actes de la Table Ronde organisée au XXe Congrès International d'Études Byzantines (Paris, 2001), éd. M. CACOUROS et M.-H. CONGOURDEAU (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 146), Leuven–Paris–Dudley, MA 2006, 101-12.

translator at the end of the twelfth century, or with Nicholaus Siculus, a thirteenth-century translator of *De mundo* who seems to be identical with Nicholaus Grecus, a collaborator of Robert Grossteste, or with Magister Nicholaus, a lexicographer. It is most likely that the *Translatio vetus* was attributed falsely to Nicholaus de Reggio, a fourteenth-century translator. Comparisons between the Greek-Latin lexicon of *De sensu* and the Greek-Latin lexicon of other translations shows that the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* cannot be attributed to David of Dinant, to any other Greek-Latin translators of Aristotle's works or to the anonymous translator of Ptolemaeus and Proclus. An investigation concerning the Greek exemplar of the *Translatio vetus* yields no evidence pertinent to the identity of the Latin translator of the text.

* * *

Appendix 1. Analysis of the Double Readings in *Su*

Nicholaus' translation of *De mundo* contains many double readings, of which there are three types. The corpus of the text has four double readings. These double readings are two equivalents of one Greek term connected by *seu* (type a). This technique was also used by Grosseteste in his translation of Simplicius' commentary of *De celo* II but not by other translators. The interlinear and marginal double readings in Nicholaus' translation of *De mundo* are of two types: two translations, with a different meaning, of one Greek term, connected by *vel* (type b); a transliteration or latinization of the Greek followed by *id est* and a translation (type c). These types of doublets are not characteristic signs of Grosseteste or his school, because they were used by translators before and after Grosseteste.[107]

In the manuscripts of the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* (collation of the first chapter in all manuscripts; collation of the other chapters in *BäBmBwSnSuTdVüWo*), I have not found any double readings with *seu*. This appendix contains an analysis of the double readings in *Su*, which are all interlinear or marginal. *Su* is not only the manuscript that contains the attribution to Nicholaus Reginus, it also contains a large number of double readings. The double readings in *Su* represent double readings that are present less abundantly in other manuscripts. The following list enumerates four different types of double readings in *Su* and presents examples of each type. In these examples I give the Greek reading(s),[108] the translation in the text of the edition (before the square bracket) and the relevant variants and double readings in *BäBmBwSnSuTdVüWo*. This analysis shows that the manuscript tradition of *De sensu* contains double readings of type (b) and (c) and of other types as well, but not of type (a). Hence, Nicholaus' translation of *De mundo* contains double readings that are characteristic of Grosseteste, whereas the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* does not.

The first two types of double readings in *Su* (1-2) suppose a knowledge of the Greek text

[107] See MINIO-PALUELLO, "I due traduttori medievali del *De mundo*", in MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula*, 108-9; Introduction by L. MINIO-PALUELLO, in *De mundo* (AL XI$^{1-4}$), xxviii.

[108] The Greek readings are based on the edition with apparatus in BLOCH, "The Manuscripts of the *De Sensu*". For the clarification of the sigla referring to (a branch of) the Greek tradition, see the same work.

of *De sensu*. Hence in all probability they cannot be attributed to a copyist but must originate with the translator (who introduced doublets) or with a reviser (who added another correct translation of the same Greek word).[109]

(1) *vel* + different translation of one Greek word

437b22	γοῦν : enim] autem *WoSu* : + vel enim *ss. Su*
439a17	τὴν αἴσθησιν : sensualitatem] sensibilitatem *SuVü* : + vel sensualitatem *i.m. Su* (in all other 16 cases, αἴσθησις is translated with sensus)
440a5	μὴ καθαραὶ : non puri] impuri *TdVü* : + vel im(puri) *ss. Su*
441a12-13	πυρουμένων : ignitis] + calefactis *ss. Su*
441a28	γὰρ : enim] autem *SuVü* : + vel enim *ss. Su*
446a10	ἐπειδὴ : quoniam] quando *Td* : + vel quando *ss. Su*

The *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* does not contain the type of double readings that are characteristic of Grosseteste or his school—two equivalents of one Greek term connected by *seu*—but it does contain doublets that are equivalent or distinct translations of one Greek term, connected by *vel*. This type of double reading has been used by several translators.

(2) *vel* + a Latin variant corresponding to a variant in the Greek tradition

438a28	ἐν **α**] ἐπ' *P* : in] a *Td* : + vel a *ss. Su*
438b27	θερμὸν C^c] θερμὴ *E* : calidum] calida *Td*: + vel (cali)da *ss. Su*
441b13	καὶ **α**] ἢ **ρ** : οὐδὲ $US^2WC^aVNvm^am^b$: et *BwWo* : vel *BmTdSn* : nec *BäSuVü*: + vel *ss. Su*

(3) Transliteration of the Greek + *id est* + translation

Another type of doublet in the translation of *De mundo* is a transliteration or latinization of the Greek, followed by *id est* and a translation.[110] Of this type, I have found only one case in the translation of *De sensu* in *Su*:

441b17	ἡ φύσις : natura] + orum (?) *sed exp. Wo* : + chimi *BäSuVüWo* : + thimi *BwSn* : + chimi id est humoris *Td* : + id est humoris *i.m. Su*: + id est humidi *ss. Wo*^{2} (It is the first time "chimus" occurs in the translation of *De sensu*. In the other instances (445b5, 446a9, 448a7) it is used as a transliteration of χυμός.)

Because the transliteration in the translation of 441b17 is not based on the Greek text, this transliteration and the explanation *id est humoris* could have been introduced by a copyist (or copyists).

(4) *vel* + correction or introduction of a copy mistake

The other doublets in *Su* cannot be attributed to the translator or to a reviser, but must be due to a copyist (or copyists), who introduced copy-mistakes or corrections of copy-mistakes on the basis of alternative readings in (an)other manuscript(s):

---

[109] As far as can be deduced from the edition by R.-A. GAUTHIER, THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Sentencia libri de sensu et sensato* (see n. 86), the doublets cannot be based on MOERBEKE's *Translatio nova* of *De sensu*.

[110] MINIO-PALUELLO, "I due traduttori medievali del *De mundo*" (see n. 24), 109-10; Introduction by MINIO-PALUELLO in *De mundo* (AL XI$^{1-2}$), xxix.

(a) Correction of a copy mistake

436a7	τὰ κοινὰ : communia] *om. sed* communia. hec habent quidam libri *add. i.m. Su*
438a25	τινὶ : ab aliquo] ab oculo aliquo *Bä* : ab alio *Bm* : ab oculo *BwSnSuWo* : + vel aliquo *ss. Su*
439a1	πρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ : iuxta cor] circa cor *Su* : vel iuxta *ss. Su*
439b2	χρωματιζόμενα : colorata] colorari *BäSu* : + vel (colora)ta *ss. Su*
439b9-10	μετέχειν : participari] percipi *BwSu* : + vel participari *ss. Su* : determinari Wo^{ac}
440a14	-- : sunt] stant *Bä Su* : + vel sunt *add. ss. Su*
440a29	κἀκείνως : et illo modo] et illa materia *SuTd* : + vel illo modo *ss. Su*
443a1	πλυτικὸν : lavabile] *om. Bä* : laudabile *BwSu* : + vel lavabile *i.m. Su*
444a27	παρέργῳ **:** adventicie] adventice *Td* : adventicicie Sn^{ac} : adiunctione $SuWo^{pc}$: + vel adventice vel adventicie *sub l. Su* : + vel adventicie *al. man. i.m.* Td^{111}
444a28	ἐκ παρόδου : adventicie] adventice *Td* : ad vencie *Bm* : adiunctione *Su* : + vel adventice *sub l. Su* : + vel adventicie *al. man. i.m. Td*
446a1	συνεχοῦς : continuus] communis *BäWo* : + vel communis *i.m. Su*
446b16-17	ὀσφραίνεται : odoretur] *BmTd*: odoret *BäBwSuVüWo* : odoratur *Sn* : + vel odoretur *i.m. Su*
447a19	τῆς νήτης : vocem] *ss.* $Bä^2$: vicem $Bä^1$ *sed del.* $Bä^2$: lucem *Su* : + vel vocem *ss. Su* : + vel vicem *i.m. Su*
447b22	ὅτι ἧττον : quoniam minus] quam minus *SnTd*, *ante* manifestum *Bm* : quoniam unius vel minus Bw^{ac} : quoniam unius *Su* : quoniam neque unius *Wo* : + vel quoniam minus *i.m. Su*

(b) Introduction of a copy mistake

438a22	τοῦ σώματος : corporis] corpus *BäBmSnTdVü* : + vel corpus *ss. Su*
439a18	ὥσπερ : Quemadmodum] Quod *Td* : + vel quod *ss. Su*
439b12	ὕδατος aque *SuWo*] aqua *BäBmBwSnTdVü*: + vel aqua *i.m. Su*
442a7	ποιεῖ τὸ ἔξω θερμόν : facit exterior calor] + vel facit interior calor *i.m. Su*
442b6	ἐν τοῖς ὄγκοις : glebis] globis *BäBmSnTdVü* : + vel globis *i.m. Su*
443b31	πιχεῖν : infundas] infundans *Vü* : infundis *BäBm* : infundit $Bw^{ac}Wo$: + vel infundit *i.m. Su*
444a27	ἔργῳ : operose] porose Td^{ac} : operorose Td^{pc} : + vel porose *sub l. Su*
444b18	ἐκείνων δ᾽ οὐθὲν : illorum autem nullum] quando illorum nullum *Td* : + vel quando illorum nullum *i.m. Su*
445a13	τῷ ἀκουστῷ : audibili] + vel (audibi)lis *ss. Su*
447b29	ὡς δ᾽αὐτως : similiter] simul *Bä* : + vel simul *i.m. Su*
448a16	ἀλλ᾽ ὡς : sed sicut] sic sunt *Bw* : sed *Bm* : sed (+ sunt *ss.*) *Wo* : + vel sic sunt *i.m. Su*

The technique of double readings that the translation of *De sensu* shares with the translation of *De mundo* (1 and 3) is not only used by Nicholaus Siculus and Grosseteste's school, but also by other translators.

[111] MS *Td* has one marginal annotation "vel adventicie", but it is not clear whether it refers to "adventice" in 444a27, or 444a28 or to both.

Appendix 2. Inadequate Greek-Latin Translations in the *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu*

The *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* (*DS*) contains many inadequate or unclear Greek-Latin translations. Many of these bad translations are due to mistakes in the Greek exemplar of the translator. This appendix contains only examples of inadequate Greek-Latin translations that probably are not due to mistakes in the Greek text but derive from the translator's technique.[112] In the following examples, I quote (a part of) a Greek sentence and then give the English translation[113] and finally the Latin *Translatio vetus* (in some cases followed by a translation of the Latin).

(1) The *Translatio vetus* of *De sensu* contains some incorrect translations, which probably are due to the translator's lack of knowledge of the Greek.

(a) Particles

In many cases the original meaning of the particle is lost:

δὴ: *om.* (6), autem (3), enim (3), ita (1), igitur (1), vero (1), quidem (1)
καίτοι: quamvis (4), etenim (1)
μέντοι: vero (2), autem (1), enim (1), itaque (1)

In the case of combined particles, the translator mostly renders only one of the particles:

ἆρ' οὖν: ergo (446b9; 449a10) ; an ergo (446a25)
δ'ἄρα: igitur (437b19); ergo (442b14); autem (447a25: the translator has probably read δ'ἄρα instead of ἄρα and has only translated the first part of the composition)
μὲν οὖν : ergo (11), autem (7), enim (2), siquidem (2), vero (2), itaque (2), igitur (1), namque (1)
μὲν γὰρ : enim (18); namque (1)
μὲν τοίνυν: quidem (1) (τοίνυν : ergo (2))

In most cases he correctly translates the disjunctive particle ἢ with *aut* (four times)[114] or *vel* (31 times)[115] and the comparative particle ἢ with *quam* (8 times).[116] Yet in two cases he translates the comparative ἢ with *vel* and in one case he translates the disjunctive ἢ with *quam*:

—*DS* 7 (448a17-18): ἔτι ἂν ἧττον ἅμα ἐνδέχοιτο αὐτα αἰσθάνεσθαι ἢ τὰ τῷ γένει ταὐτά.
it would be even less possible to perceive these sensibles <e.g., sweet and white> simultane-

[112] Many of my examples are based on the Introduction and the notes to the edition by PEETERS, *Aristoteles Latinus. De Sensu et Sensato* (see n. 1), which I have corrected.

[113] The translation of the passages of *De sensu* was partly inspired by the following translations of the Greek *De sensu*: ARISTOTLE, *De sensu and De memoria: Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary* by G.R.T. ROSS, Cambridge 1906 (reprt. New York 1973); trans. J.I. BEARE, in *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. W.D. ROSS, vol. III, Oxford 1931; ARISTOTLE, *On the Soul. Parva Naturalia. On breath*, trans. W.S. HETT, London-Cambridge 1936 (revised 1957).

[114] 437a25, 438a26, 440b22, 444a8

[115] 438a30, 439a10, 11(2), 15, 21, 440a10, 441a6, 8, b13, 442b13, 443a1, 445a4, b6, 446b13, 21, 22(2), 447a16(2), b28, 448a18, 25, 26, b1, 2, 6, 18, 22, 449a6, 13

[116] 440b31, 447a18, 19, 20, 23, b9, 25, 448a17

ously than sensibles which are in the same genus <e.g., white and black>.
Amplius, si minus simul oporteat ipsa sentire, *vel* (et *BäBwSu* : quam *Vü*) genere ipsa;

—*DS* 7 (449a4-5): μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐνδέχεται τούτων ἅμα πλειόνων ἢ τῶν τῷ γένει ἑτέρων.
for it is more possible for these <i.e., sensibles of the same sense> to be simultaneously perceived in their severalness than of those <sensibles> generically different.
magis enim oportet hec simul multa *vel* (et *Wo*) genere alia.

—*DS* 6 (446a25-28): ἆρ οὖν οὕτω καὶ τὸ ὁρώμενον καὶ τὸ φῶς, καθάπερ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς φησὶν ἀφικνεῖσθαι πρότερον τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς εἰς τὸν μεταξὺ πρὶν πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν;
Is it thus also with the object of vision and with light, just as Empedocles says that the light coming from the sun arrives first in the intervening space before it comes to our sight or reaches the earth.
An ergo ita et visibile et lumen, quemadmodum et Empedocles dicit attingere prius quod a sole lumen ad hoc quod est medium et prius ad visum *quam* ad terram?

(b) Verbs

ἄν + optative

In most cases the translator renders a *potentialis* with ἄν + optative with an indicative present,[117] with an indicative future[118] or with a subjunctive.[119] Sometimes he erroneously translates it with *si* + subjunctive, as if it were a conditional sentence with ἐάν + subjunctive:

–*DS* 7 (448a17-18): ἔτι ἂν ἧττον ἅμα ἐνδέχοιτο αὐτα αἰσθάνεσθαι ἢ τὰ τῷ γένει ταὐτά.
it would be even less possible to perceive these sensibles <e.g., sweet and white> simultaneously than sensibles which are in the same genus <e.g., white and black>.
Amplius, *si* minus simul *oporteat* ipsa sentire, vel genere ipsa;

–*DS* 5 (444b15-16): διὸ κἂν ἀπορήσειέ τις τίνι αἰσθάνεται τῆς ὀσμῆς,
so one might doubt with what organ they <i.e., fishes and insects> perceive smell
Quare *si* quis *obiciat* quo sentit odorem,

In one case an optative aorist is translated as an imperfect subjunctive. This translation is not correct, because the Latin imperfect subjunctive is used for the *modus irrealis*, while the Greek optative is used for the *modus potentialis*:[120]
–*DS* 5 (443a23-24): ....εἴρηκεν, ὡς εἰ πάντα τὰ ὄντα καπνὸς γίγνοιτο, ὁτι ῥῖνές ἂν διαγνοῖεν,

[117] For example, *DS* 5 (445a27); 6 (445b11; 446a28); 7 (448a29; 449a19-20).

[118] For example, *DS* 3 (439b10-12; 440a26-29; 440a13-14); 4 (441a28; 442b22-23); 5 (443a6-7); 6 (445b3; 445b18-19; 7, 448a30-b1).

[119] For example, *DS* 5 (443b10-11); 7 (448a22-23).

[120] However, it should be noted that in medieval Latin the present subjunctive and the imperfect subjunctive were often used interchangeably, so that the distinction between *modus potentialis* and *modus irrealis* was not as sharp as it was in classical Latin; see P. STOTZ, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters,* 4: *Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Abt. 2.5), München 1998, 320-21 §58.4.

he has said that, if all beings became smoke, the nostrils would distinguish them.

....dicit: si omnia entia fumus fiant (fiunt *Bä*), quod nares utique *discernerent*.

Participles

The translator has difficulties translating participles correctly:

–*DS* 3 (440a22): ἵνα λάθωσιν αἱ κινήσεις ἀφικνούμεναι

in order that it would be hidden that the movements arrive

ut decipiant motus *pervenientes*,

The participle ἀφικνούμεναι, which refers to the subject αἱ κινήσεις and completes the meaning of the verb λάθωσιν, is incorrectly translated as an adjective of motion.

–*DS* 2 (437b14-15): τὸ δ' ἀποσβέννυσθαι φάναι ἐν τῷ σκότει ἐξιοῦσαν... κένον ἐστι παντελῶς

It is totally idle to say that what is issuing from <the eye> <i.e., light> is extinguished in the darkness.

Dicere autem quod extinguatur in tenebris *exeuntem*,.. vanum est omnino.

The participle ἐξιοῦσαν is an accusative connected with the unexpressed subject of the object clause of φάναι. It is incorrectly translated with an accusative, for in the Latin translation *dicere* is not construed with an object clause but with *quod* + subjunctive. In order to elucidate this phrase, some copyists have changed *exeuntem* into the ablative absolute *exeunte* (*BäSnSu*) and have added specifications: *exeunte lumine* (*BwWo*) or *exeunte lumine ab oculo* (*Vü*).

–*DS* 2 (437a29): διὰ τί οὖν ἠρεμοῦντι τοῦτ' οὐ συμβαίνει

Why then does this not happen to the resting <eye>?

Quare ergo *quiescente illo* hoc non accidit?

The participle ἠρεμοῦντι, a dative depending on συμβαίνει, is translated as an ablative absolute.

–*DS* 7 (448b28-29): εἰ δέ, ᾗ μὲν ἓν τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, ἕν καὶ τὸ αἰσθανόμενον ἔσται, εἰ δὲ χωρίς, οὐχ ὁμοίως ἕξει.

but if so <in the soul>, insofar as what is formed of both <i.e., of two parts of the soul> is one, that which perceives will also be one, while if they act separately, the analogy <of the eyes> will fail.

Si vero secundum quod unum quidem quod ex ambobus, unum et *sensibile* erit; si separatim, non similiter se habebit.

Because αἰσθανόμενον (that which perceives) has been wrongly translated as *sensibile*, the original meaning of the sentence has been lost.

In some cases, the translator renders the conjunctive participle as an ablative absolute:

–*DS* 4 (441b4-5): καὶ τὰ διὰ τῆς τέφρας διηθούμενα πικρᾶς οὔσης πικρὸν ποιεῖ τὸν χυμόν,

Filtration through ash, which is bitter, makes the taste bitter.

Et que per cinerem colate, *ipso* amaro *existente*, amarum faciunt saporem.

The participle οὔσης, which is related to τῆς τέφρας, is translated by an ablative absolute. In order to clarify the meaning, the translator adds *ipso*, which refers to *cinerem*.

–*DS* 7 (447a17-18): καὶ ὅτι ἑκάστου μᾶλλον ἔστιν αἰσθάνεσθαι ἁπλοῦ ὄντος ἢ κεκραμμένου

and that it is more possible to perceive each individual thing when it is simple than when it is

mixed

et quoniam unumquodque magis sentire simplici *existente* quam commixto,

The participle ὄντος, which is related to ἑκάστου, is translated as an ablative absolute.

–*DS* 7 (447a25): ἐὰν δ' ἄρα ἴσαι ὦσιν ἕτεραι οὖσαι

if then the stimuli are equal but different

Si autem equales sint (sunt *Vü*) altera *existente*,

The participle οὖσαι, which is connected to ἴσαι, is translated as an ablative absolute and the concessive meaning of the participle is lost.

(c) Cases

The translator sometimes has difficulties translating the case and function of a word correctly. The Greek accusative is translated as an accusative:

–*DS* 5 (444b28-30): ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων ὁτιοῦν οὐδὲν δυσχεραίνει τῶν καθ' αὑτα δυσωδῶν τὴν ὀσμήν

Similarly, not one of the other animals shows repugnance to things that are *per se* malodorous with respect to smell

Similiter et aliorum animalium quodlibet non indignatur que secundum se ipsa fetidorum *odorem*,

The translator has problems interpreting the dative of identity with ὁ αὐτος:

–*DS* 6 (446b18-19): ἀδύνατον γάρ, φασί τινες, ἄλλον ἄλλῳ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀκούειν καὶ ὁραν καὶ ὀσφαίνεσθαι

for some say that it is impossible for one person to hear or see or smell the same thing as another

Impossibile enim dicunt quidam aliud *per aliud* idem audire et videre et odorare;[121]

–*DS* 7 (447b27-30): καὶ τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρόν, ἡ αὐτὴ ἢ αὐτὴ μὲν ἑαυτῇ, ἐκείνης δ' ἄλλη,

and sweet and bitter, which a sense that is self-identical, but different from the former, <discerns>,

et dulce et amarum, ipsa vel ipsa quidem *ipsius*, ipsius vero alia.

Note that the genitive ἐκείνης, which is the second term of a comparison (with ἄλλη), is incorrectly translated with a genitive instead of with an ablative (with *ab*) or a construction with *quam*.

–*DS* 7 (447b29-30): ὡς δ' αὕτως ἑαυταῖς τὰ σύστοιχα,

yet it is in the same manner as each other <that the senses perceive> corresponding qualities.

similiter *seipsa* coelementaria,

In the case of the correlative undetermined relative pronoun ὅσοι, he translates the dative as an accusative:

–*DS* 5 (443b22-24): ἡδεῖαι αἱ ὀσμαὶ... οὐδ' ὅσοις μὴ καὶ τροφὴ ἡ ἔχουσα τὰς ὀσμὰς οὐχ ἡδεῖα, οὐδε τούτοις.

neither are the smells pleasant to those to whom the food having the smell is unpleasant.

---

[121] SIWEK, who translates ἄλλῳ as "ope diversi", wrongly interprets it as a *dativus instrumentalis*. See *Aristotelis Parva Naturalia Graece et Latine*, ed. SIWEK, 51.19.

delectabiles odores... nec quecumque (quodcumque *SnTd*) si non esca habens odores non delectabiles nec istis [tristis].[122]

Usually the translator correctly translates the object genitive with αἰσθάνεσθαι as an accusative, but in the following sentence he erroneously renders it as a genitive:

–*DS* 6 (446b22-23): τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἑνὸς ἀριθμῷ αἰσθάνονται πάντες

all perceive the numerically identical and one

ipsius et unius numero sentiunt omnes;

(2) Sometimes the Latin translation becomes unintelligible:

–*DS* 3 (440a6-8): εἷς μὲν οὖν τρόπος τῆς γενέσεως τῶν χρωμάτων οὗτος, εἷς δὲ τὸ φαίνεσθαι δι᾽ ἀλλήλων,

This is one way in which colours may be produced. Another is that they appear through one another.

Unus siquidem modus generationis colorum hic; unus etiam *qui videtur* per alternos,...

In this case the translation of a substantive infinitive by a relative clause is not correct.

–*DS* 4 (441a8-10): ἢ μηδεμίαν ἔχοντος διαφορὰν τοῦ ὕδατος τὸ ποιοῦν αἴτιον εἶναι,

or if the water has no difference < in respect of savour>, <it is necessary> that there is an efficient cause <of savour>

vel, nullam habente differentiam aqua, *illud quod facit causam* esse,

–*DS* 4 (442a10-12): ταῦτα δὲ διὰ τὸ ἀντισπᾶν τῷ λίαν τρόφιμον εἶναι τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ ἐπιπολαστικόν

These <i.e., salt and vinegar> are required to counteract the tendency of the sweet to be excessively nutritive and to float on the stomach.

hec autem propter id quod contratrahunt, *cum* multum nutritivum *sit* dulce et supernatativum.

The original meaning of the sentence is lost because the dative-function of the substantivated infinitive (τῷ εἶναι), which depends on ἀντισπᾶν, has been rendered by *cum* + subjunctive.

–*DS* 6 (446a6-7): καὶ γὰρ ἐνυπάρχει δυνάμει ἡ ποδιαία τῇ δίποδι, ἐνεργείᾳ διαιρεθεῖσα.

So even the one-foot length exists potentially in the two-foot length, but actually after its separation.

Etenim inest *virtus gressibilis* bipedi actione separata.

And indeed the power of walking exists in <something> after a twofold action has been separated.

The Latin sentence is senseless because δυνάμει is translated as a nominative and ἡ ποδιαία, which is an adjective in the nominative related to a tacit <γραμμή>, is translated as an adjective determining δυνάμις.

–*DS* 6 (445b15-16): ἔτι τίνι κρινοῦμεν ταῦτα ἢ γνωσόμεθα; ἢ τῷ νῷ;

Again, by what faculty will we discern or cognize these things? By the mind?

Amplius *cui* adiudicabimus hec *cognoscenda* nisi *menti*?

It is unclear how the gerundive *cognoscenda* should be explained. The translator only uses the gerundive to render the verbal adjectives ending with -τέος. The form γνωσόμεθα, of which

[122] On 439b13 he correctly translates the dative with in + abl., but renders the plural as a singular: ὅσοις: in quocumque.

there are no variants in the manuscripts collated by Bloch,[123] could have been corrupted to γνωσόμενα and then have been misread as γνωσθησόμενα. It is not unusual that a Greek passive future participle is translated as a Latin gerundive by a medieval translator. We cannot check whether this was the technique of this anonymous translator, for the Greek *De sensu* does not contain any passive future participles. The medial future participle συστησόμενον (445a22) is translated as *constitutivum*.[124] Moreover, the first ἢ has not been translated.

–*DS* 6 (446a14-15): δυνάμει τε γάρ ἐστιν ἤδη, καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ ἔσται προσγενόμενον

for it is so already potentially, and will become so actually when taken in union <with the whole>.

Virtute enim est iam, et actione erit *ad perfectum*.

The translation *ad perfectum* is not adequate for the conditional aorist participle προσ-γενόμενον.

–*DS* 7 (448b10-11): ὁ δ' αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ΑΓ

The same argument applies to the part AC.

Eadem vero *proportio* et in a.g..

Proportio is an inadequate translation of λόγος (argument).

(3) In other cases the Latin translation can be understood, but it does not correspond with the meaning of the Greek text:

–*DS* 2 (437a20-22): οὐκ εὐποροῦντες δὲ πρὸς τέτταρα πέντ' οὔσας συνάγειν γλίχονται περὶ τῆς πέμπτης

Not, however, knowing well how to reduce <the senses>, which are five in amount, to the four <elements>, they are seriously concerned about the fifth <sense>.

non potentes autem ad quatuor, quinque existentibus, cupiunt coaptare et quintum.

Although the Latin translation does not reflect the Greek correctly, it is possible to understand what Aristotle meant. The translator has understood συνάγειν, which is the infinitive in the object clause related to εὐποροῦντες, as the object of γλίχονται.

–*DS* 2 (438a10): ἄτοπον δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐπελθεῖν αὐτῷ ἀπορῆσαι

But it is strange that it never occurred to him <i.e., Democritus> to ask

The infinitive ἀπορῆσαι is the subject of ἐπέρχεταί + τινι: "it comes to one's head".

Incongruum autem est preterire quin faciamus obiectionem.

But it is unsuitable to go by without making an objection.

The translator understands the construction as if it would be: ἐπέρχομαί τινι + ἀπορῆσαι: "I discuss something in order to ask", in which ἀπορῆσαι is epexegetical to ἐπελθεῖν.

ἂν δ' ἄνισοι, ἡ κρείττων αἴσθησιν ἐμποιήσει.

If they <i.e., the stimuli> are unequal, the stronger will produce sensation.

Si vero inequales, melior faciet sensum,

In this context, *melior* is not a satisfactory interpretation of κρείττων.

Griet GALLE (Leuven)

[123] BLOCH, "The Manuscripts of the *De Sensu*" (see n. 58), 87.

[124] This explanation is derived from PEETERS, *Aristoteles Latinus. De Sensu et Sensato* (see n. 1), 79 n. 82.